Toronto University Library

Presented by

Dr George Salmon, D.D., D.C.L., L.L.D., F.R.S.

through the Committee formed in

The Old Country

to aid in replacing the loss caused by

The disastrous Fire of February the 14th 1890



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/historicalintrod00salmuoft

S

A HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE STUDY OF THE

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:

BEING

AN EXPANSION OF LECTURES

DELIVERED IN THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., F.R.S.,

PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN;

SOMETIME REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1889.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH:

A Course of Lectures

DELIVERED IN THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

8vo. Price 12s.

13318
6

Printed at THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Dublin.*

PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE Lectures out of which the present volume has taken its origin were written some years ago, and did not aim at giving a complete or systematic account of the subjects with which they dealt. When I decided last year on sending them to the Press, I contemplated making no other change than that of altering the division into Lectures—the original division, of necessity, having mainly had regard to the length which it was convenient to deliver at one time. Accordingly, the first three Lectures of this volume contain, with but slight alterations, what was originally the introductory Lecture of my course. But as the printing went on I found additions necessary, partly in order to take notice of things that had been published since the delivery of the Lectures, and partly in order to include details which want of time had obliged me to omit, but which I was unwilling to pass unnoticed in my book. In this way I have been led on to re-write, and make additions (but without making any change in the style or in the arrangement), until I am now somewhat dismayed to find that the Lectures have swelled to two or three times their original bulk.

The additions thus made have so far completed the discussion, that I have ventured to give this volume the title of an Introduction; but it will be seen that it does not embrace all the topics frequently included under that title. I do not enter on the criticism of the text, nor do I make any analysis of the contents of the books. My main purpose has been to discuss their date and authorship on purely historical grounds; and to examine with sufficient completeness for a practical decision the various theories on the subject advanced by modern schools of criticism. It is in this latter respect that this Introduction will chiefly be found to differ from some valuable works on the same subject which are in the hands of students. Most of the original evidence requisite for the discussion has already been brought within easy reach in Canon Westcott's 'History of the New Testament Canon.' Dr. Charteris, also, in his 'Canonicity,' has rendered accessible to the English reader the collection of ancient testimonies made by Kirchhofer in his 'Quellensammlung.' According to the arrangement of Canon Westcott's book, each of the ancient witnesses is treated separately, and under each name are placed the books of the New Testament to which the witness bears testimony. According to the arrangement of Kirchhofer and Charteris, each book of the New Testament is examined in succession, and the ancient writers are cited who bear testimony to it. The latter is the arrangement I have followed. I do not always give as full a report of the evidence as the authors just mentioned have done, contenting myself with citing as many witnesses as I judge to be suf-

ficient to prove my case. But on the other hand, as I have said, I aim at giving a somewhat fuller discussion than they have done of the theories of authorship which modern sceptical writers have proposed to substitute for the traditional belief of the Christian Church. The time has passed when it could be objected that a student's time was ill-spent in becoming acquainted with such theories, on the ground that he probably would never have heard of them if he had not been asked to study the refutation. Literature in which the theories in question are treated as established facts has now obtained such extensive circulation, that a clergyman must be pronounced ill-trained for his work if he has to make his first acquaintance with these speculations when he finds them accepted among his people as the latest results of scientific inquiry.

Although my work may be described as apologetic in the sense that its results agree in the main with the traditional belief of the Church, I can honestly say that I have not worked in the spirit of an advocate anxious to defend a foregone conclusion. I have aimed at making my investigations historical, and at asserting nothing but what the evidence, candidly weighed, seemed to warrant. It would be idle in anyone to pretend that he can wholly divest himself of bias; but I must remark that the temptation to hold obstinately to traditional opinions is one to which those who are called apologists are not exclusively liable. The theories which in these Lectures I have found myself obliged to reject are now some fifty years old. They are maintained by a generation of scholars who have accepted them on the authority

of guides to whom, in their youthful days, they looked up with reverence, and whose *dicta* they regard it as presumptuous to dispute, receiving their doctrines with something like the blind submission which the teachers of the scholastic philosophy gave to the decisions of the Fathers. The temptation to apply unfairly the methods of historical criticism besets as strongly the opponents as the assertors of the supernatural. The former have found great difficulties in maintaining their position by *a priori* proof of the impossibility of miracle; for what they seek to establish really amounts to this: that, even if God exists, it is beyond the power of His Omnipotence to give His creatures convincing proof of His existence. Failing to gain many converts to this doctrine, they have tried another method of attaining their object: namely, by a criticism directed to show that the documents tendered for the establishment of miracles are so late as to be undeserving of attention. But the attempt to show this has, in my opinion, broken down, as I have endeavoured to prove in the following pages. If this result has been established, it must follow that the opponents of the supernatural will be forced to fall back on their older methods.

I have thankfully to acknowledge kind help given me in reading the proofs by my friends Professor MAHAFFY, Dr. QUARRY, and Dr. WACE, to each of whom I owe some useful suggestions. But my chief acknowledgments are due to my colleague in our Divinity School, Dr. GWYNN, who has taken, on my behalf, an amount of trouble which, if I were not somewhat ashamed of having imposed so much

labour on him, would make me congratulate myself that the publication of my Lectures was delayed until I could have the benefit of his assistance. In addition to most careful reading of all the proofs, he has been ever ready to consult authorities, and verify references for me, a service which was particularly useful to me during three months that I was at a distance from books; and he has, besides, made some special investigations on my account, such as those which I have particularly acknowledged, pp. 349, 549, 557, 595.

Readers who may compare the present with former editions of this work will perhaps find it convenient if I specify a few places where changes or additions are now made. I have added (p. 44) a note on Zahn's speculation concerning the date of the Latin Version of the New Testament: some slight addition is made (p. 86) to what had been said about Tatian's Diatessaron: Dr. Gwynn's discovery of fragments of Caius has made some change necessary in what had been said (p. 227) about Caius's reception of the Apocalypse, and about the Alogi: in a note (p. 255) I have discussed Vischer's assault on the unity of the Apocalypse: something has been added (p. 389) with regard to the date of the formation of a collection of Pauline letters, and a fuller discussion than before of the second group of Pauline Epistles has been given (p. 403). On the other hand, I have judged it sufficient to present, in an abridged form (p. 545), my

examination of Dr. Abbott's censures of the style of 2 Peter, which in the first and subsequent editions was given with more detail than now appears to be requisite. The change of form of the book, and the consequent alteration in the paging, has rendered necessary the preparation of a new Index; and though I have taken a good deal of pains, I fear it is too much to expect that I shall have altogether escaped misprints and false references both in the Index and elsewhere.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,
October, 1889.

ERRATA.

Page 209, line 18, *for* 1 John v. 24, *read* 1 John v. 20.
,, 326, line 5 from foot, *for* v. 30, *read* v. 39.
,, 397, note line 2, *for* 2 Cor. i. 17, *read* 2 Cor. ii. 17.
,, 487, note line 4, *for* Rom. iv. 7, *read* Rom. vi. 7.
,, 494, line 15, *for* James iii., *read* James ii.
,, 495, line 3 from foot, *for* Genesis xvii., *read* Genesis xviii.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY. PART I.

Page

PRINCIPLES OF THE INVESTIGATION 1

Subject of Lectures defined, pp. 1, 2. Question of Inspiration irrelevant here, p. 3; amount of external evidence of authenticity commonly required in similar cases, pp. 4—5; authenticity of N. T. books not to be denied because of the miraculous nature of their contents, pp. 6—8. Criticism based on the rejection of the supernatural; Strauss, Renan, author of *Supernatural Religion*, pp. 9, 10. Naturalistic explanation of Gospel Miracles: Paulus, p. 11; Strauss's Theory, p. 12.

LECTURE II.

INTRODUCTORY. PART II.

BAUR'S THEORY OF EARLY CHURCH HISTORY . . 13

The Tübingen (or 'Tendency') School, p. 13; its basis in the Clementine writings, pp. 14—16; St. Paul assailed in them under name of Simon Magus, p. 16. Marcion, *ib.* The Paul-Simon theory, pp. 17—19. Two kinds of Ebionites, pp. 18, 19. Wholesale rejection of N. T. books necessary to Baur's theory, p. 20; the search for anti-Paulinism in the Gospels, p. 21; unsuccessful, pp. 22, 23; Baur admits but five N. T. books as genuine, p. 23; internecine character of strife in early Church as alleged by him, p. 24; its speedy and complete reconciliation, p. 25.

LECTURE III.

INTRODUCTORY. PART III.

Page

THE ANTI-PAULINISM OF THE APOCALYPSE . . 25

Alleged anti-Paulinism of the Epistles to the Seven Churches, pp. 26, 27; improbability of this view, pp. 28, 29. The calling of the Gentiles recognized in the Apocalypse, p. 29; its alleged anti-Pauline language paralleled in Paul's own writings, pp. 30, 31. Rapidity of supposed counter-revolution in favour of Paulinism, p. 32.

LECTURE IV.

RECEPTION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EARLY CHURCH. PART I.

THE END OF THE SECOND CENTURY; IRENÆUS, CLEMENT, AND TERTULLIAN 33

Paul's teaching, as collected from his unquestioned Epistles, and from the Acts, p. 33; assumes the fact of the Resurrection, p. 34; includes miracle, p. 35. Facts admitted by Strauss as to reception of Gospels, *ib.* IRENÆUS, pp. 35—40; links connecting him with Apostolic age, p. 36; estimate of the Four Gospels in the Church of his age, pp. 36—38; his testimony retrospective, pp. 38—40. CLEMENT of Alexandria, pp. 41, 42; various texts of the Gospels, p. 41; inference from this fact, p. 42; TERTULLIAN, pp. 42—44. Early Latin version of Scriptures, p. 42; rendering of title 'Logos,' p. 45. Discussion of Zahn's theory that the Latin translation is later than Tertullian, pp. 44—47.

LECTURE V.

RECEPTION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EARLY CHURCH. PART II.

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT; CAIUS AND HIPPOLYTUS 47

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT, pp. 48—54; described, pp. 48, 49; its date, how determined, Hermas, *ib.*; conjectures as to its author, pp. 51—53; its contents, pp. 53, 54; whether

Page

St. Jerome was acquainted with it, p. 54. CAIUS and HIPPOLYTUS, pp. 55—62. *Caius*, p. 55; his estimate of the Gospels, pp. 56, 57. *Hippolytus*, p. 57; his 'Refutation of Heresies,' pp. 57, 58; his extracts from heretical writers, p. 58; use made by these of N. T. books, p. 59; especially of Fourth Gospel, *ib.*; by Valentinus, pp. 59—61; by Basilides, pp. 61, 62. First mention of St. John as author of this Gospel, p. 62; it tacitly claims him as such, *ib.*; but does not mention his name, *ib.*

LECTURE VI.

RECEPTION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EARLY CHURCH. PART III.

THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND CENTURY; JUSTIN MARTYR, TATIAN 63

JUSTIN MARTYR, pp. 63—82; his date, p. 64; mentions and cites 'Memoirs' of our Lord, pp. 65, 66; his citations vary verbally from the existing Gospels, pp. 66—67; his substantial agreement with the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 67—70; his inaccuracy in quoting the Old Testament, p. 69; improbability that he used a Gospel now lost, p. 70; whether he used apocryphal Gospels, p. 71; proofs that he knew the Fourth Gospel, pp. 71—80; Thoma's theory, Dr. Ezra Abbot, p. 72; Justin derives from Fourth Gospel his 'Logos' doctrine, pp. 72, 73; not from Philo, p. 74; hence also his baptismal language, pp. 74—76; Fourth Gospel used in the Clementines, p. 76; Strauss's failure to shake these conclusions, pp. 75—77; Dr. Edwin Abbott's views untenable, pp. 78, 79; Renan's inconsistency on this subject, pp. 78—80. TATIAN, pp. 81—86; his date and heresy, p. 81; his knowledge of Fourth Gospel, *ib.*; his 'Diatessaron,' pp. 82—86; recent recovery of Commentary on it by Ephraem Syrus, pp. 84, 85; its ample attestation of the Fourth Gospel equally with the others, p. 86. Other helps towards restoring the Diatessaron, *ib.*

LECTURE VII.

RECEPTION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EARLY CHURCH. PART IV.

Page

THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND CENTURY; PAPIAS, APOSTOLIC FATHERS 87

PAPIAS, pp. 87—105; his remains scanty and fragmentary, p. 87; unfair inferences from the silence of Eusebius, pp. 88, 89; Papias's 'Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord,' p. 90; his sources of information, pp. 90, 91; his witness to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, p. 92; recent doubts of the identity of these with our first and second Gospels, pp. 93—95. Argument from the silence of Eusebius, p. 95. Schleiermacher's theory of the 'original' Matthew and Mark, *ib.*; Renan's theory of their formation, pp. 96, 97. Meaning of the word 'Logia' in Papias's account of Matthew, pp. 98, 99; explanation of his apology for Mark's method, pp. 99, 100; probability that Papias knew Luke's Gospel, pp. 101—103; true explanation of plan of Papias's work, pp. 103—105; whether he preferred his traditions to the written Gospels, p. 104; probability that he knew John's Gospel, p. 105. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS, pp. 106—108. *Clement of Rome*, p. 106. The early Fathers do not cite the Gospels by name, nor verbally, *ib.*; *Barnabas*, pp. 107, 108.

LECTURE VIII.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. PART I.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THEIR ANTIQUITY . . 109

Inferences from the titles of the Gospels, pp. 109—111; use of the word in the singular and in the plural number, p. 110; written Gospels necessary from the first, pp. 111, 112. Our Lord's discourses as reported by the Synoptists, p. 113; presumption that these would be written down at an early date, pp. 114, 115; this presumption extends to the narrative of his actions, p. 115. These three narratives not independent, pp. 116—118; the sceptical criticism is tending to revert to the early date claimed for them, p. 118; no earlier Gospel extant, p. 119; the four

Page

took their place without authoritative decision of Church, p. 120; Luke's account explains the oral common basis of the Synoptics, *ib.*; he mentions written narrations prior to his own, p. 121; no authentic tradition as to their publication, p. 122. Early necessity for authoritative records, pp. 123—125. Gospels once published and accepted not easily changed, pp. 125—127.

LECTURE IX.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. PART II.

THEORIES AS TO THEIR ORIGIN 127

Inquiry not precluded by belief in Inspiration, pp. 127, 128; though difficult not hopeless, p. 128. Three chief hypotheses to account for the common matter of the Synoptists, p. 129; various combinations of these, *ib.*; each hypothesis to be examined irrespectively of theories of Inspiration, pp. 130—132. Alford's objection to *First and Second* Hypotheses, p. 132; verbal variations from documents in secular authors, p. 133; variations in narratives of St. Paul's conversion, *ib.* The *Third* hypothesis will account for agreements in narrating of incidents, p. 135; but the *First* or *Second* is needed to account for agreement in order of narration, pp. 136, 137; absence of agreement in order of discourses, p. 138. Gospels of Matthew and Luke independent of one another, p. 139. Various forms of *Second* hypothesis, p. 140; inadmissible modifications of it, p. 141. Modifications of *Third* hypothesis, *ib.* Hypothesis of Hebrew common document, pp. 141, 142; will account for verbal variations, pp. 142, 143. Hypothesis of common Greek original required by verbal coincidences, p. 144; and by common citations of O. T., p. 145. Further elaboration of hypothesis of Greek original, p. 146. Rushbrooke's 'Synopticon,' p. 147. Dr. Edwin Abbott and the 'Triple Tradition,' pp. 147—150; his theory of the common documents rests on an inadmissible assumption, p. 149. The Synoptists' narratives of the Passion, p. 150. The 'Triple Tradition' rests on a single attestation, p. 152; which probably is that of Peter, pp. 153, 154; traces of his testimony in Mark, pp. 154, 155. Mark represents the original source most closely, p. 155; but is possibly latest in publication, p. 156; Matthew and Luke did not copy Mark, *ib.*; Mark's last twelve verses, pp. 156—164.

Page

NOTE ON THE CONCLUDING VERSES OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL 158

Early testimony to their authenticity, pp. 158, 159. The testimony of the two great uncials, pp. 159—161. Improbability involved in the rejection of the verses, pp. 163, 164. Some questions of textual criticism cannot now be decided with certainty, p. 164.

LECTURE X.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF ST. MATTHEW.

THE HEBREW GOSPEL 165

Existence of an early Hebrew Gospel probable, pp. 165, 166. Early Patristic evidence that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, p. 167. Witness of Papias, Irenæus, and Eusebius, *ib.*; of Jerome and Epiphanius, p. 168. Internal counter-evidence, pp. 169, 170. No Greek text other than ours known to the Fathers, pp. 170, 171. Hypothesis of a two-fold original, p. 171. The 'Hebrew Gospel,' p. 172; not identical with the 'Ebionite Gospel,' pp. 172—176; not the source of the Clementine quotations, pp. 176, 177. Jerome's 'Nazarene' Gospel not the original of Matthew, pp. 177—186. Origen's evidence concerning the 'Hebrew Gospel,' pp. 179—181; Jerome's inconsistency, pp. 182—184; estimate of the value and age of this Gospel, pp. 184—186; first trace of it found in Ignatius, p. 186; it was used by Hegesippus, *ib.* Palestine was bilingual, pp. 187—189. Greek original of St. Matthew on the whole more probable, pp. 189, 190.

LECTURE XI.

APOCRYPHAL AND HERETICAL GOSPELS . . . 191

Hone's collection of N. T. Apocrypha, pp. 191—193; Hilgenfeld's, pp. 192, 193. APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, pp. 193—201. The *Protevangelium*, pp. 193—196; its antiquity, p. 195. The *pseudo-Matthew*, p. 197. The *Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 197—199; its legends of our Lord's childhood, pp. 198, 199; its date, p. 199. The *Gospel of Nicodemus* and *Acts of Pilate*, pp. 200, 201. Evangelic fragments, p. 201. HERETICAL GOSPELS, pp. 202—208; were chiefly Gnostic and Encratite, p. 203. *Gospel of the Egyptians*, *ib.* *Gospel of Marcion*, pp. 204—208; Tertullian's examination of it, p. 205; reconstruction of it, pp. 205, 206; attempt to make it out prior to Luke's, p. 206; also to John's, pp. 207, 208.

LECTURE XII.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART I.

Page

THE FOURTH GOSPEL 209

Common authorship of this Gospel and First Epistle, p. 209; motive for questioning this fact, pp. 210, 211. Early external testimony to the Epistle, pp. 211, 212. Baur assigns a late date to the Gospel, p. 212; his followers tend to place it earlier, *ib.*; Renan takes an exceptional line, pp. 212—214. Motives for denying its Apostolic authorship, p. 215; its witness to our Lord's Divinity, *ib.*; to His self-assertion, p. 216. His self-assertion attested by the Synoptics likewise, pp. 217, 218. Apocalypse admitted to be John's, p. 218. Christology of the Apocalypse, pp. 219, 220. Christology of St. Paul's Epistles, p. 221. St. John's doctrine compared with St. Paul's, p. 222. Dr. Pfleiderer on the Christology of Apocalypse, p. 223.

LECTURE XIII.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART II.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE APOCALYPSE . . 224

Diversity of style between these two books, p. 224. Early external attestation of Apocalypse, pp. 224, 225; Millennarian use of it, p. 226; tended to discredit the book, *ib.*; ascription of it to Cerinthus, p. 227; whether Caius was responsible for this ascription, *ib.* Recovery of new fragments of Caius, p. 228. The Alogi, p. 229. Did they ascribe the Gospel to Cerinthus, p. 230. Dionysius of Alexandria, pp. 230, 231. His arguments against the Johannine authorship of Apocalypse, pp. 232, 233; examination of them, pp. 234—242. Its coincidences of diction with the Gospel, pp. 235, 236; its points of difference, pp. 237, 238. Solecisms of the Apocalypse, pp. 238—241. The Greek of the Gospel, p. 241; its superiority over that of the Apocalypse accounted for, pp. 241, 242.

LECTURE XIV.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART III.

Page

THE DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE 243

Earlier date assigned by the sceptical school, p. 243. Theory of Renan and his followers, pp. 243—246. Nero the 'Beast,' p. 245; its 'Number,' p. 246. This theory imputes failure to the predictions of the book, p. 247; is incredible, pp. 247, 248; attempts to deny that failure is imputed, pp. 249, 250. Ancient conception of Prophecy, p. 250. Modern solutions of the riddles of the book are but partial, pp. 251, 252; multiplicity of solutions, p. 253. Other objections to the Neronian solution, p. 254. Neronian date not improbable, p. 255. Vischer's theory that the book is composite, pp. 255—262. Sabatier's modification of Vischer's theory, p. 259. The chapters said to be purely Jewish bear marks of Christian authorship, p. 260. The date assigned by Vischer and Sabatier to the publication of the book cannot be reconciled with their interpretation of it, p. 262.

LECTURE XV.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART IV.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE QUARTODECIMANS . 262

The Quartodecimans alleged as witnesses against Fourth Gospel, p. 262. Real difficulty in its account of Last Supper, pp. 263—265; solutions offered, p. 264; a forger would have avoided raising this difficulty, p. 265. Controversy concerning Easter, p. 266; Baur's assumption as to the Eastern commemoration, p. 267. *First recorded instance of Paschal disputes*, Polycarp and Anicetus, p. 268. Probable usage of the Apostles, p. 269. *Second recorded Paschal dispute*, Melito's book, p. 271. *Third recorded Paschal dispute*, Victor and Polycrates, p. 272. Quartodeciman testimony to Fourth Gospel, *ib.* The authority of the Fourth Gospel not affected by controversies as to the day of the Passion, 273.

NOTES ON THE ASTRONOMICAL ASPECT OF THE QUESTION 273

Jewish New Moon, p. 273. Table of New Moons, p. 274. Point of difference between Wieseler and Caspari, *ib.*

LECTURE XVI.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART V.

Page

THE GOSPEL AND THE MINOR EPISTLES . . . 275

The fourth Evangelist was (i) *a Jew*, pp. 275—277; was (ii) a Jew *of Palestine*, pp. 278—280; was (iii) *of the first century*, pp. 280—283; was (iv) *an eye-witness* of the events he relates, pp. 284—286; and *a disciple of the Baptist*, p. 285; was *John the Apostle*, p. 287. Theory of another John, 'the Elder,' pp. 287—289; this theory fails to solve the questions of authorship of the Johannine Books, p. 289; *the Minor Epistles*, p. 290—295; their authenticity questioned, p. 290; established conclusively by internal evidence, pp. 291; they confirm the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, p. 292. *The Third Epistle*, St. John and Episcopacy, pp. 293. 'The Elect Lady' of *the Second Epistle*, p. 294. Attempts to allegorize away parts of the Fourth Gospel, p. 295. Importance of the facts implied in the Third Epistle, *ib.*

LECTURE XVII.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS. PART VI.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTICS . . 296

Omissions of the Fourth Gospel, p. 296; instance as regards our Lord's birthplace, p. 297; absurdity of Renan's view of this case, pp. 298, 299; St. John's manner is to assume previous knowledge in his readers, p. 300; his 'Irony,' pp. 301—303; his knowledge of previous Gospels, pp. 304, 305; his last chapter, p. 304; he wrote after Peter's death, p. 305; supplemental character of his Gospel, p. 306; his silence as to the Eucharist, *ib.*; the institution of the Eucharist by our Lord involves a claim of Divinity on His part, p. 307; Synoptic account of institution confirmed by St. Paul, p. 308; early Christian belief concerning it, *ib.*; the Eucharist implied in fourth Gospel, p. 309; as also baptism, p. 310; and the Ascension, p. 311. The Fourth Gospel written with a purpose, *ib.*; its coincidences with the Synoptics, p. 312; it contains facts omitted by them, p. 314; *a priori* probability of our Lord's earlier visits to Jerusalem recorded in it, *ib.*; traces in the Synoptics of the Judæan ministry, 316.

LECTURE XVIII.

Page

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES 317

Date of this book a vital matter, p. 317. External attestation of it, pp. 317—319. Internal evidence, p. 320. Modern theories of its compilation, p. 321. The 'we' sections, pp. 321—327; the author of these, p. 322. Tradition of Luke's authorship of Third Gospel and Acts, p. 323. Imagined marks of spuriousness, p. 324. Unity of authorship of Acts inferred from its structure and contents, p. 325; and from its diction, p. 326. Literary skill of the author, p. 327. Motives for denying its unity, pp. 328—335. Its supernatural element, p. 329. Its representation of Paul's relations with the Twelve, pp. 330—335. The Tübingen version of Paul's History, p. 331; its incredibility as compared with the account in Acts, p. 332. Absence of Pauline topics from speeches ascribed to him in this book, p. 334. Supposed artificial parallelism between its narratives of Peter and of Paul, p. 335. Frequent occurrence of parallel events in history; the supposed parallel wants its climax, p. 336. Abrupt close of the Acts, p. 337. The author's principle of selection of topics, p. 338; his opportunities of gaining information, p. 339, 340; his account of Philip the Deacon, *ib.*; he possibly used as materials a diary of his own, p. 341. His reports of Paul's speeches, pp. 342—347. His slight use of Paul's Epistles, p. 344; for example, that to Philippians, p. 345; Galatians, 345; 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 346. Reports of Peter's speeches in Acts compared with his First Epistle, p. 347. External confirmations of the author's accuracy, pp. 347—349. Holtzmann's theory that the author followed Josephus, p. 350. Discrepancies between the Acts and Josephus, p. 351.

LECTURE XIX.

APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF THE APOSTLES 352

No other Acts but Luke's admitted into the Canon, p. 353. Apocryphal Acts mostly of heretical origin, pp. 353, 354; afterwards expurgated for orthodox use, p. 354. (i) The *Abgar Legend*, pp. 354—357; extant form of it, p. 356. (ii) The *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, pp. 357—362; Tertullian's account of its origin, p. 357; tinged with Encratism, p. 358; its story, pp. 358—360; still extant, 361; time and place of composition, pp. 361, 362. Excesses in the direction of Encratism easily con-

Page

doned by the orthodox, 362. (iii) The *Acts of St. Thomas*, pp. 363—372; Leucian Acts, p. 363; light thrown by the Acts of Thomas on Gnostic ideas, p. 364; narrative of this book, pp. 365—370; Ritual described in it, pp. 367—369; its doctrine, p. 371; date and place of composition, pp. 371—372. (iv) The *Acts of St. Peter*, the Clementines, pp. 372–374; the 'Circuits of Peter,' and 'Preaching of Peter,' p. 373; the Simon-Paul theory, pp. 373, 374; 'Acts of Peter and Paul,' p. 375; Feast of 29th June, pp. 376, 377; rival traditions concerning Peter, p. 378. (v) The *Acts of St. John*, pp. 378—384; heretical character of the Leucian Acts, pp. 379, 380; second-century traditions concerning John, pp. 381—383; later legends, p. 383; *Assumption of the B. V. M.*, pp. 384—386.

LECTURE XX.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES 387

The Sceptical school not agreed which of these to reject, pp. 387, 388. Four groups of them, p. 389. A collection of Pauline Letters early made, p. 390; this probably set the example of making other collections of letters, p. 391. Probable time and place of collection of Pauline Letters, p. 392. St. Paul used by Justin Martyr, *ib.* Methodius and Justin, p. 393. FIRST GROUP, pp. 395—403; 1 *Thessalonians*, pp. 395—398. 2 *Thessalonians*, pp. 398—402; its prophecy of the Man of Sin, pp. 399—401; external attestation of both Epistles, p. 401; precaution against forgery, *ib.*; lost Epistles, p. 402. SECOND GROUP, pp. 403—415; note of early date stamped on these Epistles by the character of their contents, p. 403; short duration of the struggle to impose circumcision on Gentile converts, *ib.*; necessarily early date of Letters written while this struggle was going on, p. 404. Similar inference from the fact that at the time they were written Paul's Apostolic authority was disputed, *ib.* *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 405; abstract of its argument, p. 406. Comparison with *Romans*, pp. 407, 408; point of difference between the two Epistles, p. 409. *The Epistles to the Corinthians*, pp. 409, 410. Ambiguity of name Galatian, pp. 410—413. No need to suppose that the fickleness of the Galatians must be accounted for by their Celtic origin, p. 413; concluding chapter of *Romans*, pp. 413, 414. THIRD GROUP, pp. 415—428; *Philippians*, pp. 415, 416; *Philemon*, p. 416; *Colossians*, pp. 416—423; external attestation, p. 416; internal evidence, pp. 417, 418; objections grounded on its diction, pp. 418, 419; on its Christology, p. 420; on its reference to Gnostic teaching, pp. 420—423; *Ephesians*, pp. 423—433; external

Page

evidence, pp. 423, 424; its affinities with 1 Peter, p. 424; its close likeness to *Colossians*, p. 425; Paley's account of this fact, *ib.*; rejected by sceptical critics, *ib.*; question of priority between the two, p. 426; Holtzmann's theory, p. 427; this Epistle contradicts modern theories of early Church history, p. 428; the Epistle was written when the admission of Gentiles was recent, p. 430; ruling topics of these two Epistles distinct, p. 431; literary excellence and influence of Ephesians, p. 432. FOURTH GROUP, pp. 433—452; *Pastoral Epistles* rejected, yet used by Renan, p. 433; external attestation, pp. 433—435; rejection by early heretics, p. 435; objections founded on—(1) their diction, p. 436; on (2) the controversies they deal with, pp. 436, 437; on (3) the difficulty of harmonizing them with the Acts, pp. 437, 438; their diction probably marks them as St. Paul's latest work, pp. 438, 439; their historical contents suggest like conclusion, p. 440; they imply Paul's release from the imprisonment recorded in Acts, pp. 440—444; independent evidence of this release, pp. 442, 443; objections to late date, pp. 444, 445; internal evidence for 2 *Timothy*, pp. 446—452; its Pauline character, pp. 446—448; its details, pp. 448, 449; its genuineness carries with it that of 1 *Timothy* and *Titus*, pp. 451, 452; Renan's estimate of all three, p. 452.

LECTURE XXI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS 453

Question of authorship, not of authenticity of *Hebrews*, p. 453. Use of it by Clement of Rome, pp. 453, 454. Accepted by whole Eastern Church as St. Paul's, pp. 454, 455. Testimony of Clement of Alexandria, pp. 454, 455. View of Origen, pp. 455, 456. Western opinion adverse, pp. 456, 457. Tertullian ascribed it to Barnabas, pp. 457, 458. Reaction under Jerome and Augustine, p. 458. Evidence of MSS. and Versions, p. 459. Its canonicity well established, *ib.* Its anonymousness, p. 460. Internal evidence for and against Pauline authorship, pp. 460—465; individual passages, pp. 460—462; its doctrine Pauline, p. 462; it uses Pauline language and mannerisms, pp. 462, 463; its O. T. citations, p. 463; its Alexandrian colouring, p. 464; its general style un-Pauline, pp. 464, 465. Conjectures as to authorship, pp. 465, 466; considerations in favour of ascription to Barnabas, pp. 466—468. Probably addressed to Jewish Christians of Jerusalem, pp. 468—471. Written from Italy, p. 471. Lower limit of date, p. 472; upper limit doubtful, pp. 472, 473. Note on the *Codex Claromontanus*, p. 473.

LECTURE XXII.

Page

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER 475

Eusebius's classification of N. T. Books, pp. 475, 476. External attestations of *1 Peter*, pp. 477, 478; it is included in all Canons except the Muratorian, p. 478. Internal difficulties alleged against it, pp. 479, 480. Written while Christians were liable to be punished as such, p. 480. It contradicts Baur's views of early Church history, pp. 480, 481. Its Paulinism of doctrine, p. 481. Place of composition, 'Babylon,' pp. 481—484. Roman martyrdom of Peter, p. 484. Addressed to Christians dispersed in Pontus, &c., p. 485. Its coincidences with *Romans*, pp. 485, 486; with *Ephesians*, pp. 486—489. Seufert's theory, p. 488. Its coincidences with *Epistle of James*, p. 489. Its originality and individuality, pp. 490, 491.

LECTURE XXIII.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES 492

This Epistle classed by Eusebius among 'Antilegomena,' p. 492. The 'Seven Catholic Epistles,' *ib.*; evidence of Origen concerning it, p. 493; of Clement of Alexandria, pp. 493, 494; of Hermas, pp. 494, 495; probably of Clement of Rome, p. 495; of Irenæus, p. 496; other authorities, *ib.* Internal evidence, pp. 497—501. James, 'The Lord's Brother,' first Bishop of Jerusalem, p. 497; probability of the usual ascription of the Epistle to him, pp. 497, 498. Written for Christian Jews, p. 498; probably residents in Syria, p. 499. The author a personal follower of our Lord, pp. 500, 501; wrote before fall of Jerusalem, pp. 501, 502; his picture of the Jews confirmed by Josephus, p. 502. Other internal evidences of early date, pp. 503, 504; its doctrine not anti-Pauline, pp. 505—506; its silence as to disputes of Paul's time, p. 506; late date assigned to it by sceptical school, p. 507. Purity of its Greek, 508; its verbal coincidences with *Romans*, pp. 509, 510. Its substantial agreement with Paul's doctrine, *ib.*; its teaching closely akin to O. T. Prophets, p. 510; but not merely Judaic, pp. 511, 512. Character of the author as shown in it, p. 513; its moral precepts, *ib.*; moral effects of Christian teaching, pp. 514, 515. This Epistle why placed first of the Catholic Epistles, p. 515.

LECTURE XXIV.

Page

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE 516

Historical attestation of the books of N. T. unequal, p. 516; a few of them were doubted by critics in fourth century, p. 518. Cause of the scantiness of attestation of Epistles of James and Jude, pp. 518, 519; of the two, Jude's has better external attestation, p. 519; especially in the West, p. 520. Jude, one of 'the Lord's brethren,' p. 521; tradition concerning his grandsons preserved by Hegesippus, *ib.*; doubt whether he was of the Twelve, p. 522; what we are to understand by 'Brethren of our Lord,' pp. 522, 523. Date of the Epistle, p. 523; against whom were its censures directed? pp. 524, 525. Its use of Jewish Apocrypha, pp. 525—528; the 'Assumption of Moses,' pp. 525, 526; the 'Book of Enoch,' pp. 527, 528. The Syriac translation of the Catholic Epistles, p. 528.

LECTURE XXV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER . . . 529

Doubts in the Church of the authority of this Epistle, pp. 529, 530. Early opinion unfavourable to it and other of the 'Catholic' Epistles, pp. 530, 531. General acceptance attained by them all, p. 531. Question reopened at the Reformation, *ib.* Opinion of Epiphanius favourable, p. 532; inconsistency of Jerome, *ib.*; and of Didymus, *ib.* Evidence of MSS. and Canons, p. 533. Opinion of Origen, *ib.*; of Firmilian, p. 534. Old Latin Version, *ib.* Doubtful use of this Epistle by Clement of Alexandria, *ib.*; by Irenæus, pp. 535, 536; its use by pseudo-Clement, 536; by Theophilus of Antioch, p. 537. Prediction in this Epistle of the destruction of the world by fire, pp. 537, 538. This destruction early became a point of Christian belief, p. 537. Use of 2 Peter in so-called Second Epistle of Clement, p. 538. Doubtful use of 2 Peter by Hermas and Clement of Rome, *ib.*. Its acceptance far short of that of *1 Peter*, *ib.* Grotius's theory, 539. The author claims to be Peter, *ib.*; if not Peter, is a forger, p. 540; this alternative must be faced, 541. Relation between *2 Peter* and *Jude*, pp. 542, 543. Difference of style between *1* and *2 Peter*, pp. 543, 544; points of resemblance between them, pp. 544, 545. Coincidences of *2 Peter* with Petrine speeches in *Acts*, p. 545.

Page

Dr. Edwin Abbott's attack on *2 Peter*, pp. 545—558. Its *unworthiness of style*, pp. 545—547. 'Baboo' Greek, p. 545. Defects in its Greek are natural, if it was written by a Palestinian Jew, p. 546; but cannot affect the question of its genuineness, pp. 546, 547. Its faults of style not discovered by the Greek Fathers, 546. Its *alleged borrowings from Josephus*, pp. 547—558. Difficulties in accepting the Petrine authorship, p. 547. Archdeacon Farrar's opinion, pp. 548, 549. Alleged coincidences with Josephus merely verbal, p. 549. Not within brief compass, p. 550; nor in same sequence, *ib.*; nor do they occur in the case of unusual words, p. 551. No N. T. writer keeps within the limits of Biblical language, *ib.* The Greek of Philo, pp. 552—555. Discussion of the words and combinations relied on by Dr. Abbott, pp. 554, 555. Coincidences with Philo's writings found in *1 Peter*, p. 557; also elsewhere in N. T., *ib.* Result of examination of Dr. Abbott's criticism, p. 558. Newly-discovered Stichometry, p. 559.

LECTURE XXVI.

NON-CANONICAL BOOKS 560

The Apocalypse of Peter, pp. 560—564. Recognized in the Muratorian Fragment, p. 560; quotations from it by Clement of Alexandria, *ib.*; and by Macarius, p. 561. Its use not quite extinct in the fifth century, p. 562. Whether included in the Sinaitic MS., p. 563; the Psalms of Solomon, *ib.* Conjectural ascription of passages to this Apocalypse, p. 564; other Apocalypses, *ib.* *The Epistle of Barnabas*, pp. 565—572. External attestation, pp. 565, 566. Impossibility of accepting some of the contents as inspired, pp. 566, 567. Whether it would be possible to acknowledge its Apostolic origin and deny its inspiration, p. 568; attitude of the writer towards Judaism, p. 569; date of the Epistle, 570; to what Church addressed, p. 571. *The Epistle to Clement*, pp. 572—579. Written in the name of the Church of Rome, p. 572. Importance of the Bishop of Rome merged in the importance of his Church, *ib.* Proofs of the early use of the Epistle, p. 573; date of the letter, p. 574; varying accounts of the order of the first Roman bishops, p. 575. No good reason for doubting that Clement was really at the head of the Roman Church, *ib.* Whether the Church of Corinth was in his time governed by a single person, p. 576; extreme amount of disorder in Corinth, *ib.* The prayer of Manasses, *ib.* Bearing of Clement's letter on

the question of Roman supremacy, p. 577; Clement a Jew, *ib.*; authorities for the text of Clement, p. 578. The Second Epistle of Clement, *ib.* *The Shepherd of Hermas*, pp. 579—593. External testimony, pp. 579, 580. Disuse of non-Canonical writings after rise of Montanism, p. 579. Tertullian and the Shepherd, p. 580. Contents of the Shepherd, p. 581. The date of Hermas, p. 582. The book written in good faith, pp. 583, 584; and accepted as a record of real revelations, p. 586; written in the Episcopate of Clement, p. 587. Rejection of Muratorian account, p. 589. Lightfoot's hypothesis that the original of this fragment was in verse, p. 590. Church organization in the time of Hermas, p. 591. Prophets in the early Church, p. 592. Hermas belonged to this order, *ib.*; whether he was a Jew, p. 594. *Hermas and Theodotion*, pp. 594—608. The 'Thegri' of Hermas explained by Mr. Rendel Harris from Dan. vi. 22, p. 594. Dr. Hort's further inference, *ib.* Preliminary consideration unfavourable to his inference, p. 595. Greek translations of the Old Testament, pp. 595—599. Theodotion's version of Daniel used in the Christian Church, pp. 596, 597. Epiphanius's account of Greek translations not trustworthy, p. 598. Theodotion's version in use before the time of Irenæus, p. 599. The version used by Hippolytus, Clement, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian, respectively, p. 600. A silent rejection of the Septuagint not probable, p. 602. Reasons for believing that there had been a previous version, p. 603. Characteristics of the Chisian Daniel, *ib.*; its affinities with the Apocryphal Esdras, *ib.* Did the New Testament writers make use of the Chisian version? p. 604. Neither Clement of Rome nor Baruch recognize it, p. 607. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 609—625. External testimony, p. 609. The 'Church Ordinances,' p. 610. Barnabas and the 'Two Ways,' p. 611. The Western form of the 'Two Ways,' *ib.* Krawutzcky's theory, p. 612. Bryennius's 'Teaching of the Apostles,' *ib.*; its account of Church organization, p. 613. Whether the author was an Ebionite, p. 615. Relations of the Didaché to Barnabas and Hermas, p. 616. Dr. Taylor on the Didaché, *ib.* Hypothesis that the Didaché is founded on a pre-Christian manual for the instruction of proselytes, p. 617. Relations of the Didaché to Barnabas, p. 618; and to Hermas, p. 619; Western form of the book, *ib.* Whether the Didaché in its present form had early circulation in the East, p. 621; how much of it may be referred to a pre-Christian model, p. 622; its instructions about baptism, *ib.*; on prayer, p. 623; on the Eucharist, *ib.*; the last chapter, p. 624; whether known to Origen, *ib.*

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Part I.

PRINCIPLES OF THE INVESTIGATION.

THE subject appointed for our Lectures this Term is The Bible; but that opens up a field so wide, that to treat adequately of all that it is desirable should be known about it would give us employment, not for one Term, but for several years. Last year you attended Lectures on Natural Religion and on Christian Evidences. I assume that you then went through the proofs that there is a God; that there is no impossibility in His revealing His will to His creatures, using miracle or prophecy as credentials to authenticate His message; and that you went through the proofs of our Lord's divine mission, establishing the conclusion that He was the bearer to the world of a revelation from God. Then, in logical order, follows the question, How is that revelation to be known to us? what are the books that record it?—in other words: What is the Canon of Scripture?

In this investigation the determination of the New Testament Canon comes before that of the Old. We must first determine what the books are which contain authentic records of the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles; because we can then use their testimony to the older books, which they reverenced as divinely inspired. Next after the question of the Canon comes that of Biblical Criticism. Supposing it to be established that certain books were written, containing an authoritative record of Divine revelations, we have still to

inquire whether those books have come down safely to us—how we are to remove all the errors which may have accumulated during the process of transcription in many centuries, and so restore the texts to their original purity. Perhaps here might follow questions concerning the Translation of these texts, for without translation books written in Hebrew and Greek cannot be made available for the instruction of our people. At any rate, we have to consider questions concerning the Interpretation of these books. May we follow the same rules as we do in interpreting any ordinary book, and be satisfied in each case with that plain meaning which it seems the writer intended; or does the fact that the books are divine—that the real author is not man, but God; that there may, therefore, often be a meaning unknown even to the human agent who was commissioned to write the words—oblige us to employ special methods of interpretation in order to discover the deeper spiritual meaning? And, lastly, we must inquire what is involved in the Divine Inspiration we ascribe to these books. Does it exclude the supposition of the smallest inaccuracy being found in them in science, history, moral or religious teaching? If we admit the possibility of any such inaccuracy, can we put any limits to our concession?

The subjects I have named—the Canon, the Criticism, the Interpretation of our books, and the question of their Inspiration—are by no means all that might be discussed in treating of the Bible; yet these alone form a programme to which it is impossible to do justice in the time at my disposal, and in practice I have found that, with whatever subject I begin, I am obliged, if I wish to treat it at all adequately, to crowd out nearly all the rest. At present I am about to take up the subject which seems in logical order the first—the question what books contain the authentic record of the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles—in other words, the question of the New Testament Canon.

I wish to keep the question I have named quite clear of any discussion as to the Inspiration of the sacred books, such discussion plainly belonging to a later stage of the investigation. I wish to examine into the evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the Bible in the same

way as in the case of any ordinary books. It is clearly one question: At what date and by what authors were certain books written? And quite another question: Is there reason to believe that the authors of these books were aided by supernatural guidance, and if so, what was the nature and extent of that supernatural assistance? The former is, as we shall presently see, a question of vital importance in the controversy between Christians and unbelievers; the latter is one internal among Christians, and only admits of discussion among those who are already convinced of the historic credibility of the New Testament books, and who, because they believe what these books relate about Jesus of Nazareth, find no difficulty in believing also that He endowed with special powers those whom He commissioned to write the revelation which He brought into the world.

I make these remarks at the outset, because it enables us at once to set aside certain topics as irrelevant to the present investigation. Suppose, for example, it be alleged that there are plain contradictions between the first Gospel and the fourth; if we were engaged in an inquiry as to the Inspiration of the Gospels, it would be of the utmost importance to examine whether and how far this allegation is true. But it may be quite possible to set it aside as entirely irrelevant, when we are only inquiring whether or not both Gospels were written by Apostles. It is the constant experience of anyone who has ever engaged in historical investigation to have to reconcile contradictions between his authorities; but such contradictions must reach a high point in number and gravity before they suggest a suspicion that the opposing statements do not both proceed, as they profess to do, from persons having a first-hand knowledge of the matters about which they write.

I have just said that I wish to investigate the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the Bible in the same way as we should in the case of any uninspired book. But we are not quite permitted to do so. Those who would approve of interpreting the Bible according to the same rules by which we should interpret any other book apply very different rules in determining the authorship of its parts from what are used

in the case of other books. If we were to apply to the remains of classical literature the same rigour of scrutiny that is used towards the New Testament, there are but few of them that could stand the test. There are many of you who count as good classical scholars, who have always received with simple faith that what you read in your printed books is the work of the author to whom it is commonly ascribed, and have never applied your minds to consider what answer you could give to anyone who should deny it. You are very familiar, for instance, with Horace. Do you know what interval separates the oldest manuscript of his works from the age of Augustus, in which the poet is said to have lived? Can you fill up the gap by quotations from ancient authors? Do you know what ancient authors mention him or quote his poems? Can you tell how far the earliest quotation is separated in time from the poet himself? Can you tell what extent of his writings is covered by quotations? Can you give separate proofs for each book of the Odes, of the Satires and Epistles, and for the Art of Poetry? And if you are able to give a proof for every book, can you meet the requirements of a more severe critic, who might demand a distinct proof of the Horatian origin of every ode of every book? I suppose the chances are that you would not attempt to answer these questions; because, though you probably have heard of the theory of the Jesuit Hardouin, that the Odes of Horace and other classical books were written by Benedictine monks in the dark ages, it is not likely that you have given that theory a serious thought. Yet, if we were called on to refute it, by producing quotations from the Odes by any writer who lived within two centuries of the poet's death (and later testimony than that would not be thought worth looking at in the case of a New Testament book), we should be able to make only a very unsatisfactory reply. One example is often cited to show how little this kind of investigation is in practice judged to be necessary. The Roman History of Velleius Paterculus has come down to us in a single very corrupt manuscript, and the book is only once quoted by Priscian, a grammarian of the sixth century; yet no one entertains the smallest doubt of its

genuineness.* The first six books of the Annals of Tacitus are also known to us only through a single manuscript which came to light in the fifteenth century. Not long ago an elaborate attempt was made to show that all the books of the Annals were forged in that century by an Italian scholar, Poggio. And it was asserted that 'no clear and definite allusion to the Annals can be found until the first half of the fifteenth century.' The latest editor of the Annals, Mr. Furneaux, is what, if the subject of his labours were a New Testament book, would be called an 'apologist': that is to say, he believes that the traditional doctrine as to the authorship is true, and that the supposed discovery of forgery is a mare's nest; yet, in answer to the assertion just quoted, he can only produce one allusion, by no means 'clear and definite,' and that of a date 300 years later than the historian. Thus you see that if the external testimony to the New Testament books, which I shall discuss in future lectures, had not been forthcoming, we might still have good reason for holding fast to the traditional theory of their authorship. But where external proof is most abundant in the case of profane authors, it falls considerably short of what can be produced in support of the chief books of the New Testament.

The reason, however, why a more stringent test is applied to our books is on account of their contents, namely, because the books contain accounts of miracles and what purport to be prophecies. Now, at first sight, it appears unreasonable to allow this consideration to enter when we are discussing the authorship of books. The works of Livy contain accounts of prodigies which I may perhaps think Livy credulous for believing, yet I am not on that account in the slightest degree inclined to doubt that Livy was the author of the history which bears his name. Still more does the remark apply to the accounts of miracles which swarm in the writings of the monkish historians. I disbelieve the miracles, but I make no question that the histories which relate those

* This case is discussed in the controversy between Boyle and Bentley about the Epistles of Phalaris.

miracles were written by the authors to whom they are ascribed. But here is the pinch of the matter. These miraculous tales to which I refer relate for the most part to events which the narrators represent as having occurred a long time before their own date. When honest and intelligent men relate things of which they have personal knowledge, as a general rule we do not find them telling of anything miraculous. In short, it is only throwing into other words the statement that a miracle is an exception to the ordinary course of nature, to say that an account of a miracle is not likely to occur in true history, and therefore that, if we meet with such an account, it is likely to proceed from persons not truthful or not well informed. So it is a canon of criticism that stories embellished with miraculous ornaments are distant in time from the age in which the scene is laid. Troy may have been really taken; Achilles and Agamemnon may have been real persons; but when we read in the Iliad of gods and goddesses taking part in the battles round the city, this in itself is reason enough to suspect that Homer lived at such a distance from the events which he relates as permitted him to imagine the men of former days to be very different from 'such as mortals now are,' so that things might have happened to them unparalleled in his own experience. On these principles, then, it is contended that our sacred books, from the mere fact of their containing stories of miracles, are shown not to be the work of contemporaries.

If there is one narrative of the New Testament which more than another contains internal proof of having been related by an eye-witness, it is the account of the voyage and shipwreck of St. Paul. I recommend to your attention the very interesting monograph of Mr. Smith, of Jordan Hill, who himself sailed over the entire course, and by a multitude of minute coincidences verified the accuracy of St. Luke's narrative. Yet, because the story tells of miracles performed in the island on which Paul was cast, it has been supposed, without the smallest reason of any other kind, that these things must have been added by a later hand.*

* Davidson, for instance, says ('Introduction to the New Testament,' II. 134): 'The description of the voyage and shipwreck of Paul on his

The same things may be said as to the prophecies which our sacred books contain. In judging of an ordinary book there is no more certain canon of criticism than that the book is later than the latest person named in it, or the last event described in it. If we read a book which contained mention of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel and of the battle of Waterloo, it would take an amazing amount of evidence to convince us that the book was written in the reign of Queen Anne. It is by taking notice of anachronisms of this kind that the spuriousness has been proved of works which had imposed on an uncritical age; as, for example, the 'Epistles of Phalaris,' which were exposed in Bentley's famous essay, or the Decretal Epistles, purporting to be written by the early Bishops of Rome, on which so much of the fabric of Roman supremacy has been built. Well, the same principles of criticism have been freely applied to our sacred books. Porphyry contended that the prophecy of Daniel must have been written by some one who lived later than Antiochus Epiphanes, who is clearly described in the book: the latter half of Isaiah, it is urged, must be later than Cyrus: the Gospel of St. Luke must be later than the Destruction of Jerusalem, which it describes as to be 'trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled,' showing, it is said, that the writer not only lived after the siege, but so long after as to have known that Jerusalem remained for a considerable time in a condition of abiding desolation.

Now, I have intimated in what I have said that I am ready, within reasonable limits, to adopt the canons of criticism to which I have referred. But I cannot admit them to be applicable without exception. Miraculous embellishments

---

way to Rome is minute and accurate, proceeding from an eye-witness. A few notices here and there betray a later hand, especially those which are framed to show the wonder-working power of the Apostle, such as xxviii. 3–5, 8, 9.'

Dr. S. Davidson, for some time Professor in the Lancashire Independent College, published an Introduction to the New Testament, in three volumes, 1848–51. In this the main lines of traditional opinion were followed; but his views show a complete alteration in the new Introduction, in two volumes, which he published in 1868. My quotation is from the second edition of the later book, published in 1882.

may be a ground for suspecting that the narrative is not contemporaneous with the events; but if it is asserted that miraculous stories are never told by men contemporary with the things related, that certainly is not true. I have, at different times, read in periodicals accounts of spiritual manifestations which I entirely disbelieve, yet in many cases impute to the narrators no wilful intention to deceive, nor do I doubt that they were, as they profess, actually present at the scenes they describe. The Life of St. Martin of Tours, by his friend Sulpicius Severus, is full of the supernatural. I do not find that any of those who refuse to believe in the miraculous stories attempt to justify their disbelief by maintaining that Sulpicius was not the author of the Life. These are instances of what I reckon as false miracles; but the course of lectures of last year must have been a failure if they did not establish that true miracles, though from the nature of the case not of common occurrence, are still possible. If so, when they actually do occur, the witnesses of them may relate them in true histories. In short, if miracle and prophecy be impossible, there is an end of the whole matter. Your faith is vain, and our teaching is vain.

Now, this principle, namely, the absolute impossibility of miracle, is the basis of the investigations of the school, some of whose results must be examined in this course of lectures. Two of its leading writers, Strauss and Renan, in their prefaces, make the absolute rejection of the supernatural the foundation of their whole structure. Renan* (p. lii.) declares that he will accept a miracle as proved only if it is found that it will succeed on repetition, forgetting that in this case it would not be a miracle at all, but a newly-discovered natural

* The first edition of the 'Vie de Jésus par Ernest Renan' was published in 1863. It was followed by six successive volumes, relating the history of the 'Origines du Christianisme': that is to say, the formation and early history of the Christian Church. The last volume, bringing the history down to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, was published in 1882. The references in these lectures are usually to an 1863 edition of the 'Life of Jesus,' which alone was available when they were written. It has not been necessary for my purpose to examine minutely the modifications introduced into later editions, because the changes in Renan's views are sufficiently indicated in the later volumes of his series.

law. Strauss,* equally, in his preface (p. xv) declares it to be his fundamental principle that there was nothing supernatural in the person or work of Jesus. The same thing may be said about a book which made some sensation on its publication a few years ago, 'Supernatural Religion.'† The extreme captiousness of its criticism found no approval from respectable foreign reviewers, however little they might be entitled to be classed as believers in Revelation. Dates were assigned in it to some of our New Testament books so late as to shock

* D. F. Strauss (1808–1874), a pupil of Baur, published, in 1835, his 'Life of Jesus,' the mythical theory propounded in which gave rise to much controversy, and stimulated other attempts to disprove the historic credibility of the Gospel narratives. The book had rather fallen into oblivion when, in 1864, Strauss, availing himself of the labours of those who had written in the interval, published a new 'Life of Jesus,' 'for the German people.' It is to this popular Life that I refer in the text. In 1872, Strauss broke completely with Christianity, in a book called 'The Old Faith and the New.'

† This book, published, vols. i. and ii. in 1874, vol. iii. in 1877, obtained a good deal of notoriety by dint of enormous puffing, great pains having been taken to produce a belief that Bishop Thirlwall was the author. The aspect of the pages, bristling with learned references, strengthened the impression that the author must be a scholar of immense reading. The windbag collapsed when Lightfoot showed that this supposed Bishop Thirlwall did not possess even a schoolboy acquaintance with Greek and Latin, and that his references were in some cases borrowed wholesale, in others did not prove the things for which they were cited, and very often appealed to writers whose opinion is of no value. But what I wish here to remark is, that what really made the book worthless was not its want of scholarship, but its want of candour. An indifferent scholar, if he were industrious and honest, and, I must add, modest enough not to find fault with the translations of better scholars than himself, might compile a book which would only need the removal of some surface errors to be a really valuable contribution to knowledge. But want of candour vitiates a book through and through. There is no profit in examining the conclusions arrived at by a writer who never seems to care on which side lies the balance of historic probability, but only which conclusion will be most disagreeable to the assertors of the supernatural. For myself, I find instruction in studying the results arrived at by an inquirer who strives to be candid, whether he be orthodox or not; but I have little curiosity to find out the exact amount of evidence which would leave a captious objector without a word to say in justification of his refusal to admit it.

Lightfoot's answers to 'Supernatural Religion' appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, December, 1874; January, February, May, August, October, 1875; February and August, 1876; May, 1877. In addition to their temporary object of refutation, these articles contain so much of permanent value on the criticism of the remains of the second century, that the announcement is welcome that they are at length to be republished.

'Supernatural Religion' has also been dealt with by Westcott in a Preface to the later editions of his 'New Testament Canon.'

anyone who makes an attempt fairly to judge of evidence. And the reason is, that the author starts with the denial of the supernatural as his fixed principle. If that principle be, in his eyes, once threatened, all ordinary laws of probability must give way. It is necessary at the outset to call your attention to this fundamental principle of our opponents, because it explains their seeming want of candour; why it is that they are so unreasonably rigorous in their demands of proof of the authenticity of our books; why they meet with evasions proofs that seem to be demonstrative. It is because, to their minds, any solution of a difficulty is more probable than one which would concede that a miracle had really occurred.

Now, it has become more and more plain that, if it be granted that our Gospels were written by the persons to whom they are ascribed, two of whom were Apostles, men who had personal knowledge of the things which they relate, and whose whole narrative bears the impress of honesty, then the reality of miracles necessarily follows. No one has proved this more clearly than Strauss. He has conclusively shown that anyone who has determined to begin by asserting the absolute impossibility of miracle cannot come with a perfectly unbiassed mind to investigate the history of our sacred books, because an acceptance of the traditional account of their origin would be absolutely fatal to this first principle. Strauss begins his latest work on the life of Jesus by criticizing the works of his predecessors, who were as disinclined as himself to admit the reality of miracles, and who yet accepted the traditional account of the authorship of the Gospels; and he shows that every one of them failed, and could not help failing, to maintain this inconsistent position. Paulus* may serve as a specimen of writers of this class. He receives the Gospel narratives as in some sense true; the Evangelists do not intend to deceive; they tell things that really occurred, but through an error of judgment they represent incidents as miraculous which in truth are capable of a natural explana-

* Paulus (1761–1851), Professor, first at Jena, afterwards at Heidelberg, published his 'Commentary on the New Testament,' 1800–1804, and his 'Life of Jesus' in 1828.

tion. For example, according to him, there was nothing miraculous in Christ's feeding of the multitude. But the example of Christ and His Apostles freely distributing their scanty store among the people shamed all the rest into producing and sharing with their neighbours what they had secretly brought each for himself; and so all were filled, and supposed there had been something supernatural in the multiplication of the food. Similarly, Paulus does not deny that our Lord *seemed* to walk on the water; but, since of course He could not really have done so, he concludes that He walked on the bank of the lake, where, through an optical delusion, his movements conveyed a false impression to the spectators. He so far believes the story of the announcement by an angel of the Saviour's Incarnation as to concede that the Virgin Mary truly told that a stranger had come in to her with this message, who represented himself to be the angel Gabriel; but since this could not possibly be true, we must conclude that the messenger was an impostor. These few specimens are enough to give you an idea of the mass of improbabilities and absurdities which are accumulated in the working out of this scheme, so that we may fairly say that the history, as Paulus tells it, is a more miraculous one than if we take the Gospel narratives in their literal sense. It is unnecessary for me to waste words in exposing these absurdities, because no one has a more lively sense than Strauss himself of the failure of the attempts of his predecessors to write a non-miraculous life of Jesus; and he owns distinctly that, if the historical character of the Gospels be ever conceded, it will be impossible to eliminate miracle from the life of Christ.*

Strauss's own solution, you no doubt know, was to deny that the Gospels *are* historical. According to him, they are not written by eye-witnesses of the things related, but are legends put together at a considerable interval of time after the supposed events. How Jesus of Nazareth succeeded in collecting a number of disciples, and in inspiring them

* 'Sind die Evangelien wirklich geschichtliche Urkunden, so ist das Wunder aus der Lebensgeschichte Jesu nicht zu entfernen.'—*Leben Jesu*, p. 17.

with a persuasion, not to be shaken by the unhappy end of his life, that he was the promised Messiah, Strauss very imperfectly explains. But his theory is, that a community of Jewish Christians arose who somehow or another had come to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and who had all from childhood been brought up in the belief that the Messiah was to have certain distinguishing marks, that he was to be born in Bethlehem, and soforth; that then stories circulated among them purporting to show how Jesus actually did all that according to their notions he ought to have done; and that these stories, being in perfect accordance with their preconceived notions, when once started were readily believed, and in simple faith passed on from one to another, until in process of time they came to be recorded in the Gospels. It is not the business of this Term to expose the weakness of this theory; and, indeed, Strauss himself appears to have become sensible what a difficult task he had set himself when he undertook to deny the truth of the Gospel histories, and yet clear the historians of conscious imposture. Certainly, there is a very perceptible shifting of ground from his original work, published in 1835, in the new popular version brought out for the use of the German people in the year 1864. But common to both is the principle of the absolute rejection of the supernatural; and this I single out because the investigation in which I wish to engage you proceeds on an opposite plan, and therefore will naturally lead to a different result. My investigation aims at being purely historical. It refuses to be dominated by any philosophical or pseudo-philosophical principle. I wish to examine the evidence for the date of the Christian books on the same principles on which I would act if they were ordinary profane histories, without allowing myself to be prejudiced for or against them by a knowledge of their contents, or by fear of consequences which I shall be forced to admit if I own these works to be genuine. For I do not hold our present experience to be the absolute rule and measure of all possibilities future and past; nor do I deem it so incredible that God should reveal Himself to His creatures, as to refuse to listen to all evidence for such a fact when it is offered.

II.

Part II.

BAUR'S THEORY OF EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

In his new Life of Jesus, Strauss has greatly availed himself of the labours of Baur* and of the school founded by him, called sometimes, from his place of residence, the Tübingen school, or, from the nature of their theories, the Tendency school. It will be advisable to give you, by way of preface to our course, some short account of these theories: not only because of the wide acceptance they have met with from writers of the sceptical school both in Germany and of later years in England, but also because the view which they present of the history of the early Church affects the credit to be given to the testimony of that Church concerning our sacred literature. There is no use in calling a witness without making an attempt to remove prejudices which you know to be entertained, whether against his honesty or his means of information. Therefore, before producing to you evidence as to the reception of the Gospels by the early Church, it is expedient to inquire whether certain speculations are deserving of regard, which represent that Church as having altered so much and so rapidly from its original form, as to be put under a strong temptation to falsify the documents which relate its early history. According to Baur, our books are not the innocent, purposeless collection of legendary tales for which the disciples of Strauss might take them; all, even those which seem least artful, are put together with a purpose, and have a '*tendency*.' Just as of Mr. Dickens's novels, one is intended to expose the abuses of the Poor Law system,

* F. C. Baur (1792-1860) published in the Tübingen 'Zeitschrift' for 1831, a paper on the Christ-party in the Church of Corinth, which contained the germs of the theory of which an account is given in the text. The fully developed theory was given in his 'Paulus,' published in 1845.

another of the Court of Chancery, another of Ecclesiastical Courts, and so forth; so each of the Christian books, however innocently it may seem to profess to give straightforward narrative, is really written with a secret design to inculcate certain dogmatic views.

But what are these dogmatic views? To answer this we must expound the history which Baur gives of the early progress of Christianity. He manufactured it mainly out of his own notions of the fitness of things, with very slender support from external authority; and it has obliged him to condemn as forged or interpolated the great mass of existing ancient documents, since they are so perverse as not to be reconcilable with the critic's theory. The main pillar of the theory is a work of by no means great antiquity as compared with the others which are to be discussed in this course of lectures, being not older than the very end of the second century. I speak of the spurious literature attributed to Clement of Rome, a favourite character with the manufacturers of apocryphal literature in the second or third century. The history of these writings is so remarkable, that I cannot employ a few minutes better than in giving you some account of them. The work originated among the Ebionites, or Jewish-Christian heretical sects. In its earliest form it contained discourses ascribed to the Apostle Peter, both in controversy with heathen, and also with heretics, of whom Simon Magus was made the representative and spokesman. This work underwent a great variety of recastings. It is doubtful whether Clement was introduced into the very earliest form of it; but he was certainly, at a comparatively early date, made the narrator of the story; and the account of Clement's history gradually grew into a little romance, which, no doubt, greatly helped the popularity of the work. Clement tells how he had been brought up as a rich orphan at Rome, his parents having been lost in his early childhood. He gives an affecting account of his search for religious truth, which he seeks in vain among the schools of the philosophers, but there finds nothing but strife and uncertainty. At last news is brought to Rome of the appearance of a wonder-working prophet in Palestine. Clement sails in search of

him, arrives after the death of Jesus, but meets Peter, and is instructed and converted by him. Travelling about with Peter, he finds first his mother, then his brothers, then his father; and it is from these successive recognitions that the work called the 'Clementine Recognitions' takes its name. This is one of two forms in which the work is still extant; the other, called the 'Clementine Homilies,' being as respects the story substantially the same, but as respects the discourses worked into it, and the doctrine contained in them, a good deal different. The 'Homilies' contain the Ebionite doctrine in its strongest form; in the 'Recognitions' the repulsive features of Ebionitism are softened down, so as to make the book not altogether unfit for use among the orthodox, and in fact the 'Recognitions' are only preserved in a Latin translation made for the use of the orthodox by a Church writer, Rufinus. There is good evidence that another form, still more orthodox, which has not come down to us, was once in circulation. And though the heretical character of these Clementine writings was well known to the Fathers, who therefore rejected their doctrine, yet many of the things these writings tell about Peter passed into Church tradition. In particular, this Clementine literature has had a marvellous share in shaping the history of Christendom, by inventing the story that Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that he named Clement to succeed him in that See.

At the revival of learning these writings were at first treated with contumely as a good-for-nothing heretical figment. Long time passed before it was noted that, though the book be regarded as no more than a controversial novel, yet, dating as it does from the end of the second century, it must be a most valuable source of information as to the history and opinions of the sect from which it emanated. Baur, in particular, has called special attention to the anti-Paulinism of the work; and it is quite true that when we look into it carefully, we find that Paul and his labours are passed over in silence, Peter figuring as the Apostle of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. In one passage in the 'Homilies' the dislike of Paul passes the bounds of mere silence. For Simon Magus is described as 'withstanding Peter to the face,' and

declaring that he was 'to be blamed.'* Many a reader might innocently overlook the malice of these expressions; but when attention is called to them, we can hardly deny that the coincidence of language with that in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 11) leads to the surmise that under the character of Simon a reference to Paul is cloaked; and that Paul is intended by the enemy, *ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος*, who opposed St. Peter and St. James. We see also what interpretation is to be put on a controversy as to relative superiority between Simon Magus, who claims to have seen our Lord in *vision*, and Peter, who had actually seen Him in the flesh. It must be admitted that the writer shows a covert dislike to Paul; but we must remark, at the same time, that the obscurity with which he veils his assault on the Apostle shows plainly that he dared make no open attack, and that his views were, at that time, shared by no influential party in the Church.

But the Tübingen school pounced with avidity on this book. Here, they say, we have the key to the true history of the origin of Christianity. Epiphanius tells us that the Ebionites rejected Paul's Epistles, and looked on him as an apostate. This book, then, may be regarded as a specimen of the feelings towards Paul of an early section of the Christians. Baur's idea is, that in all this anti-Pauline rancour we have a 'survival' of an earlier state of things, the memory of which had been lost, owing to its variance with the Church's subsequent doctrine. At the beginning of the third century we have, in one corner of the Church, men who hate Paul with the utmost bitterness, though, in deference to the then general opinion, they are obliged to cloak their hatred under disguises. At the same time we have, in another corner of the Church, the Marcionites,† who recognize no Apostle but Paul, who utterly reject the Jewish religion and the Old

* In order that the coincidence with the Epistle to the Galatians may be more easily recognized, I adopt the language of the Authorized Version in translating '*ἐναντίος ἀνθέστηκάς μοι*,' '*κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις*' (*Hom.* xvii. 19).

† The Chronicle of Edessa names A.D. 138 as the date of the rise of the heresy of Marcion, and this is probably as near the truth as we have the means of going. The heresy had reached formidable dimensions when Justin Martyr wrote his Apology.

Testament, and who set aside all the earlier Apostles as of no authority. What, asks Baur, if these extreme views on both sides be not, as had been supposed, heretical developments, but survivals of a once general state of things? Those who themselves hold our Lord to have been mere man find it natural to believe that this must have been the earliest belief of His followers. Consequently, the theory is that the whole Christian Church was originally Ebionite; that Paul was a heresiarch, or introducer of novel doctrines violently condemned by the great mass of existing believers, of whose feelings towards Paul these Clementine writings are regarded as a fair specimen; that the representations in the Acts of the Apostles that Paul was on good terms with the elder Apostles are altogether false, and that, on the contrary, the early Church consisted of two parties, Pauline and anti-Pauline, bitterly opposed to each other.

Such is the general outline of the theory; but speculation has particularly run wild on the assault on Paul in the Clementines under the mask of Simon Magus. Sceptical critics jump at the conclusion that Simon Magus was the nickname under which Paul was generally known; and some even go so far as to maintain that the account in Acts viii. is a covert libel on St. Paul, which St. Luke, notwithstanding his Paulinism, has been so stupid as to perpetuate in his history; Simon's offer of money to the Apostles representing Paul's attempt to bribe the other Apostles into recognition of his claims by the gift of money which he had collected for the poor saints at Jerusalem. I feel ashamed of repeating such nonsense; but it is necessary that you should know the things that are said; for you may meet these German dreams retailed as sober truth by sceptical writers in this country, many of whom imagine that it would be a confession of inability to keep pace with the progress of critical science, if they ventured to test, by English common sense, the successive schemes by which German aspirants after fame seek to gain a reputation for ingenuity.

A more careful examination of the Clementines shows that they did not emanate from that body which opposed Paul in his lifetime. There appear, in fact, to have been two

distinct kinds of Ebionites. One kind we may call Pharisaic Ebionites, who may be regarded as representing those who strove to combine the acknowledgment of the Messiahship, though not the Divinity, of Jesus with the maintenance of the full obligation of the Mosaic Law. They appear never to have been of much influence, and before long to have died out. But the Ebionites among whom the Clementines originated represented quite a different set of opinions, and appear to have been a continuation of the Jewish sect of the Essenes.* Among their doctrines was a fanatical horror of the rite of sacrifice, which they could not believe to have been divinely instituted. The whole Temple service was abomination in their eyes. They believed that the true prophet had appeared in divers incarnations, Adam being the first, and Jesus the last. The story of the fall of Adam, of course, they rejected. And with these opinions it was necessary for them to reject great parts of the Old Testament. The Pentateuch alone was used by them, and of this large parts were cut out as interpolated. You will remember that Paley, in his 'Evidences,' quotes an apocryphal Gospel as ascribing to our Lord the saying, 'Be ye good money-changers.' This they interpreted as a direction not to be deceived by the false coin which purported to be God's Word. This doctrine, of which the Clementine 'Homilies' are full, would be as repulsive as Paul's own doctrine to the orthodox Jews whom Paul had to encounter; and therefore, as I say, these Clementines have no pretence to date from the times, or to represent the feelings, of his first antagonists in the Christian Church. The true history of these people seems to have been that, after the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem by Titus, some of the Essene communities, who lived on the other side of Jordan, and who knew that Jesus had predicted the destruction of that Temple to whose rites they always had been opposed, became willing to own Jesus to

* On these two kinds of Ebionites, see Lightfoot's 'Galatians,' p. 318. The Church History of the period is likely to be misunderstood if the identity of the latter kind with the Elkesaites is not perceived; and if it is not recognized, how little claim these heretics have to represent any considerable body, even of Jewish Christians; and how late their origin was by their own confession.

have been divinely sent, but retained a number of their own peculiar opinions. They appear to have made a few converts among the Jews dispersed by the fall of the capital, but not to have extended themselves very widely; and it is not till the end of the second century, or the beginning of the third, that some of them made their way to Rome. They had among them some men of literary skill, enough at least to produce a forgery. Among the documents they brought to Rome, for instance, was one called the 'Book of Elkesai,' which purported to be a revelation of their peculiar doctrines, but for which, it is interesting to remark, no higher antiquity was claimed than the reign of Trajan, a time when all the Apostles were dead. They accounted for this late date by a theory that the ordinary rule of God's Providence was that error should come first, and that the truth which corrected it should be revealed later. An early book of theirs, 'The Preaching of Peter,' was improved, first into the form known as the 'Recognitions,' afterwards into the 'Homilies,' and was made to include these Elkesaite revelations. The making Simon Magus the representative of Pauline ideas has all the marks of being an after-thought. There is not a trace of it in the 'Recognitions,' through the whole of which, as well as in every part of the 'Homilies' but the one already referred to, Simon is Simon and Paul is Paul. But, from the nature of the composition, the opinions which the writer means to combat must be put into the mouth of some of the characters in the story. When the object is to combat the doctrines of Marcion, Simon is made the exponent of these doctrines. But this furnishes no justification for the statement that there was a general practice of nicknaming Paul as Simon. As far as we can see, the author of the 'Recognitions' is quite ignorant of it.

As the anti-Pauline party is judged of by the Ebionites of the second century, so the school of Marcion is supposed to represent the opposing party. Thus the Christian society is said to have included two schools—a Judaizing school and a Gnostic or philosophizing school—violently hostile to each other. It is not exactly our experience that theological schisms heal up so rapidly and so completely that in fifty

years no trace remains of them, nor even memory of their existence. But so, we are told, it happened in this case. And as in the process of time the bitterness of the dispute abated, arose the Catholic Church, in which both Peter and Paul were held in honour; and then were attempts made to throw a veil over the early dissensions, and to represent the first preachers of Christianity as at unity among themselves.

It remains to test this whole theory of the conflict of Pauline and anti-Pauline parties in the early Church by comparison with the documentary evidence; and the result is that it bears the test very ill, so much so that, in order to save his theory from destruction, Baur has been obliged to make a tolerably clean sweep of the documents. In four of Paul's Epistles some symptoms may be found which can be interpreted as exhibiting feelings of jealousy or soreness towards the elder Apostles. But there is nothing of the kind in the other nine. The genuineness of these, therefore, must be denied. The Acts of the Apostles represent Paul as on most friendly terms with Peter and James, and these Apostles as taking his side in the controversy as to imposing Judaism on the Gentiles. The Acts, therefore, cannot be true history. Not only the discourses ascribed to Peter in the Acts, but the first Epistle, which the ancient Church unanimously accepted as Peter's, is thoroughly Pauline in doctrine. We must, therefore, disregard ancient testimony, and reject the Epistle. The earliest uninspired Christian document, the Epistle of Clement of Rome, confessedly belongs to the conciliatory school, Peter and Paul being placed in it on equal terms of reverence and honour. It, too, must be discarded. So, in like manner, go the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the former of whom writes to the Romans (ch. v.), 'I do not pretend to command you, like Peter or Paul.'

Now, it is very easy to make a theory on any subject if we are at liberty to sweep away all facts which will not fall in with it. By this method the Elkesaites were able to maintain that the Old Testament did not sanction the right of sacrifice, and Marcion that the New Testament did not recognize the God of the Jews. But one has a right to suspect any theorizer if, in order to clear the ground for a foundation for his theory,

he has to begin by getting rid of the previously accepted facts. So it is a presumption against this theory of Baur's, that we find him forced to get rid of nearly all the documents purporting to come from the Apostolic age, because, notwithstanding that they have been searched with microscopic minuteness for instances of Pauline and anti-Pauline rancour, scarcely anything of the kind can be found. I will give a specimen or two of these supposed instances, which will enable you to appreciate the amazing amount of misdirected ingenuity which has been spent in elaborating this system. The first is a specimen which is thought by those who have discovered it to be an exceedingly good and striking one. St. Matthew (vii. 22, 23), in the Sermon on the Mount, makes our Lord speak of men who say, 'Lord, Lord,' and who will, at the Last Day, appeal to their prophesying, their driving out devils, and their doing of miracles in the name of Jesus, but who will be rejected by Him as doers of lawlessness (*ἀνομία*), whom He had never known. It may surprise you to hear that this sentence was coined by the Jewish Christian author of the record as a protest against the opposition to the Law made by Paul and his followers. And it may surprise you more to hear that St. Luke is highly complimented for the skill with which (xiii. 26) he turns this Jewish anti-Pauline saying into one of a Pauline anti-Jewish character. He substitutes the word *ἀδικία*, 'injustice,' for *ἀνομία*, 'lawlessness,' and he directs the saying against the Jews, who will one day appeal to having eaten and drunk in the presence of Jesus, and to His having taught in their streets, but, notwithstanding, shall be told by Him to depart as doers, not of *ἀνομία*, but of iniquity, and shall break forth into loud weeping when they see people coming from the east and west, and north and south, and sitting down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while themselves are shut out.

One other sample I will give you. St. Matthew says (x. 27), 'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.' St. Luke (xii. 3)—'Whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed on the housetops.'

It is contended that, whereas St. Matthew represents the Apostles as directed to speak in the light and on the house-tops, St. Luke turns the phrase into the passive—the proclamation shall be by other than the Apostles, namely, by St. Paul and his party.

When, however, all ingenuity has been tried, there is no escaping the acknowledgment that, if we are to look for an anti-Pauline Gospel, it cannot be any of those we have now. That Matthew's Gospel was made primarily for the use of Jews most critics are agreed. Yet, do we find this Jewish Gospel hostile to the admission of Gentiles? It opens (ii. 1) with an account of Gentile Magi from the distant East coming to worship the infant Saviour. In the first chapter which relates any miracle (viii. 5), we have an account of one performed at the request of a Gentile, who is commended as exhibiting faith not to be found in Israel; and on this occasion there is taught the doctrine of the admission of the Gentiles, not to equal privileges with the Jews, but to a place vacated by the rejection of the Jews. 'Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' It is to be noted that the Gentile centurion of St. Matthew is in St. Luke made a kind of Jewish proselyte—'He loveth our nation, and hath built us our synagogue' (vii. 5). In a later chapter of St. Matthew the same doctrine is taught even more plainly —'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof' (xxi. 43). The parting command of our Saviour recorded in this Gospel is, 'Go ye and make disciples of all nations' (xxviii. 19). In the account of our Lord's death, a critic with a keen eye for 'tendency,' might pronounce Matthew strongly anti-Jewish. It is Luke (xxiii. 28), not Matthew, who records our Lord's words of tender pity—'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.' St. Matthew seems anxious to throw the guilt of our Lord's death off the Gentiles, and on the Jews. Pilate's wife warns her husband to 'have nothing to do with that just man' (xxvii.

19). Pilate himself washes his hands before the multitude and declares that he is 'innocent of the blood of this just person.' The Jews accept the awful burden, and exclaim, 'His blood be on us, and on our children' (*ib.* 24, 25). Nay, we find in our St. Matthew a trait also found in St. John's Gospel, on account of which the latter has been characterized as strongly anti-Jewish, namely, that the unconverted members of the Jewish nation are spoken of as 'the Jews,' implying that the Christians were an entirely separate community. In the last chapter of St. Matthew (*v.* 15) we have, 'This saying is commonly reported among *the Jews* unto this day.' When it is attempted to get rid of these evidences of anti-Jewish tendency by the assertion that none of these things could have been in the original Matthew, we can only reply, that it is open to anyone to say that the original Matthew contained just whatever he likes. But no theory can be said to rest on a scientific basis which, instead of taking cognizance of all the facts, arbitrarily rejects whatever of them do not happen to accord with the hypothesis.

It is plain from what I have said that, when every ingenuity has been expended on our documents, they fail to yield any sufficient evidence of the bitter hostility which, according to Baur's theory, existed between the two great sections of the early Church; and, therefore, these documents are condemned by him and his followers as, at least in their present shape, the work of a later age, which had set to work to remove all traces of the ancient dissensions. Baur acknowledges only five of our books as genuine remains of the Apostolic age—four Epistles of Paul and the Apocalypse. The four Epistles are those to the Galatians, Romans, and the two to the Corinthians. It is not much to be grateful for that he grants the genuineness of these, for they carry on their face such marks of strong personal feeling, and are so manifestly not the work of a forger, but the outpouring of a heart stirred to its depths by the incidents of a real life, that whoever should deny their genuineness would pronounce on himself the sentence of incapacity to distinguish true from false. But these Epistles have, in Baur's eyes, the further recommendation, that they are those in which Paul has to

deal with his Jewish opponents, and therefore are the most likely to yield proofs of that jealousy of the elder Apostles and hostility to them which Baur's theory demands. Afterwards, when I come to speak of St. Paul's Epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles, I will try to show how little ground there is for the assertion that the view of Paul's relations to the heads of the Jerusalem Church, exhibited in the Epistle to the Galatians, is irreconcilable with that presented by the Acts. If, indeed, anyone imagines that the Apostles were not men of like passions with ourselves, and therefore counts it a thing impossible that one should feel or express dissatisfaction with the conduct of another; if he cannot believe that they should be differently influenced by different aspects of the truth, or be of various opinion as to the immediate necessity of guarding against different forms of error; why, then, we need not go beyond what the Epistle to the Galatians tells of the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch in order to convince him of his mistake. But when we have fully conceded that there was no rigid sameness of utterance among the first preachers of the Gospel, we still fall immensely short of what Baur's theory requires us to grant. In order to adopt his view, we must hold that the differences between St. Paul and the elder Apostles were not like those which are known to subsist at the present day between political leaders of the same party—differences which do not prevent them from sitting in the same cabinet and joining in a common policy; but rather like the differences which separate the leaders of opposite parties, or even of hostile states. The most Ultramontane Roman Catholic could not think worse of Martin Luther than, if we believe our modern guides, the members of the Church of Jerusalem thought of St. Paul.* The wildest Protestant could not hate the Pope more than St. Paul's Gentile converts are imagined to have hated the Apostles of the circumcision.

But the most wonderful part of the theory is the alleged

* 'Jamais, en effet, l'Eglise chrétienne ne porta dans son sein une cause de schisme aussi profonde que celle qui l'agitait en ce moment. Luther et le scolastique le plus routinier différaient moins que Paul et Jacques.'—Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 289.

end of the schism, in which Peter and Paul came to be regarded as brothers, and held in equal honour. That is the same as if we Protestants held in equal honour Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola, and as if it was our popular belief that these two great saints had loved each other as brethren. Surely, the Pauline Christians must have been the most forgiving men in the world. They had been victorious along the whole line. The Judaizers had disappeared. No one dreamed of imposing the yoke of circumcision on the Gentiles. Even in the Clementines no such burden is sought to be laid on Gentile converts. Yet these Gentiles agreed in giving equal honour to the great Apostle who had gained them their liberty and to the bigoted Jews who had cast out his name as evil, nicknamed him Balaam and Simon Magus, and organized conspiracy against him wherever he taught! Surely this is a theory not so recommended by probability that we can afford to condone its deficiency in documentary proof; and, for my part, I am well content to abide by the old representations made by the author of the Acts of the Apostles.

III.

Part III.

THE ANTI-PAULINISM OF THE APOCALYPSE.

I have said that the Apocalypse is also received by Baur, and is acknowledged by him as a genuine work of the Apostle John. It is scarcely necessary to say, that he does not look upon it as containing any real prophecy, but merely anticipations of the future, which have been falsified by the event. In owning the Book of the Revelation to be Apostolic, the modern school of destructive criticism is more easy of belief than part of the early Church; for in the third century there were many who denied the authority of this book, and I shall have occasion afterwards to speak of an argument by Dionysius of Alexandria, that the difference in style between this book and the Gospel of St. John proves that both could not

have the same author. This argument has been eagerly adopted by the modern school, only with a reversal of its application. They hope now, by conceding that the Apocalypse is the work of John, to found, upon differences of style, an argument that the fourth Gospel cannot be his; and, in fact, it is now alleged to be one of the most certain results of criticism, that these two works cannot have the same author. This, again, suggests a topic which I will not anticipate, as the argument must be considered when I come to discuss the Gospel according to St. John. Suffice it now to say, that the Apocalypse is held to be strongly Jewish and anti-Pauline.

In the Epistles to the Seven Churches, Paul is held to be the enemy against whom St. John, writing in our Lord's name, warns his disciples. Indeed, one German teacher of this school (Volkmar) carries out the theory to the absurdity of imagining that by the false prophet predicted as upholding the power of the Beast we are to understand St. Paul. In the Epistle to the Church in Smyrna (ii. 9) we read:—'I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.' And in that to the Church in Philadelphia (iii. 9):—'I will make them of the synagogue of Satan which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie, to come and worship before thy feet.' We are asked to believe that those false Jews, with whom St. John has broken so entirely as to call them the synagogue of Satan, are St. Paul and his party. The angel of the Church of Ephesus (ii. 2) is praised because 'he has tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and has found them liars.' Here again we are asked to believe that it was Paul's claim to apostleship which was thus rejected; and we are again and again invited by Renan to notice the remarkable fact, that in Ephesus, where St. Paul had resided so long, and laboured for a time so successfully, a few years after his departure his followers had completely disappeared, and his claims to apostleship had been generally owned to be based in falsehood. Lastly, you will remember that in the Epistle to the angel of the Church in Pergamos those are condemned (ii. 14, 15) who 'hold the doctrine of Balaam,' and also those who 'hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans.' It had been con-

jectured long since—and the conjecture has been received with more favour than I think it deserves—that Nicolaus, 'conqueror of the people,' was but a Greek translation of the name Balaam. The etymology seems to me a forced one; but Renan adopts this view, with the addition, that Balaam was a nickname for St. Paul, and that the doctrine of Balaam, the teaching 'to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication' (by which he understands marriage with Gentiles, regarded by strict Jews as fornication), was the doctrine of St. Paul. Renan would further have us believe that, in another New Testament place where Balaam is mentioned, St. Paul is intended—I mean the Epistle of Jude (*v.* 11). For though that Epistle is one for which we cannot produce as early testimony as for the rest, and is consequently not admitted into Baur's meagre collection of genuine Apostolic Letters, yet the temptation is great to gain some addition to the scanty evidence of anti-Pauline rancour in the early Church; and so we have presented to us Jude, the brother of James, describing Paul as a 'filthy dreamer,' who 'defiled the flesh, despised dominion, and spoke evil of dignities' (namely, of the original twelve Apostles), and who 'ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward.'

Now we can understand easily how it was that an obscure heretic, in the end of the second century, not daring to attack Paul openly, because he knew that such attack would have condemned his book to exclusion from the whole circle of Christian readers, masked his assault under a false name; so that while he seemed only to expose the wickedness of Simon Magus, and could even, if a question were raised by any of the orthodox, plausibly maintain that no covert meaning was intended, he would yet be understood by the few initiated as gratifying their dislike to Paul. But Apostles such as St. John and St. Jude would have had no need to descend to such subterfuges. It is not consistent with the character of the outspoken 'son of Thunder' (either as that character is made known to us by Scripture, or in the traditional story of his treatment of the heretic Cerinthus) to suppose that, if there were false teachers whom he thought it his duty to describe as the synagogue of Satan, he would

have disguised the object of his reprehension under the veil of Balaam or Nicolaus, and never have ventured to mention the name of Paul. Why should not John, one of the pillar Apostles (Gal. ii. 9) of the Church, and Jude, the brother of one of the great three, have courage to speak plainly? But let that pass: at least their warning must have been intelligible at the time it was given. The Church would have known who it was that it was intended to describe; and if so, is it credible that the tradition should have completely perished out of memory, and that Christians, by whom the great Apostle of the Gentiles was held in the highest love and veneration, should still cherish these letters to the Seven Churches, and this Epistle of St. Jude, never once dreaming that they were honouring party pamphlets of an opposing school?

It is worth while to remark how singularly obtuse the Paulinist party were as to the meaning of the assaults levelled against their master; or at least at what an early date all knowledge as to the true meaning of these assaults had perished. I have already remarked how innocently the author of the Acts of the Apostles tells the story of Simon Magus, without betraying any suspicion that under the mask of this arch-heretic Paul was to be recognized. Twice in the Acts (xv. 20, 29; xxi. 25) the same writer goes out of his way to represent the Apostolic heads of the Church of Jerusalem as condemning the eating meat offered to idols and fornication, in evident ignorance that these two things were prominent heads of the accusation brought against the Pauline Christians by their Jewish opponents. Nay, St. Paul himself is represented as concurring in the condemnation, and as actively employed in disseminating it (xv. 25; xvi. 4). Once more, the author of the Second Epistle of Peter (who, if he were not Peter himself, certainly wrote at an early date, and (iii. 15) was an ardent admirer of Paul) adopts as his own (ii. 15) all that was said in Jude's Epistle about Balaam, the son of Beor, and clearly has not the smallest suspicion that under that name Peter's 'beloved brother' Paul was intended.

I shall have occasion to say something hereafter as to the

use of tradition in the interpretation of Scripture, and the present instance serves very well to illustrate what that use is. For you can see that these theories as to the reference to Paul, both in the Apocalypse and in the Epistle of Jude, might have deserved some respectful consideration had they dated from the first century instead of the nineteenth. If it had been the case that in early times there was hesitation to acknowledge the authority of these books, on the ground that they disparaged the apostleship of Paul, then we should be bound to look the possibility in the face, that tradition had preserved correctly the interpretation put on these documents by those to whom they were first addressed, and to inquire dispassionately whether that interpretation were the right one. But an interpretation is condemned at once by the mere fact that it was left to the nineteenth century to discover it, and we may fairly refuse to give it any respectful hearing. But I think it well not to cut the matter short, as I might; and will go on to show that we can find parallels in Paul's Epistles for all the passages that are cited from the Apocalypse as anti-Pauline.

It must be remembered that the doctrine of the calling of the Gentiles is taught as distinctly in the Book of the Revelation as in the saying of the Gospel (x. 16)—'Other sheep I have which are not of this fold.' We read, indeed, in the Apocalypse of a sealing of 12,000 out of each of the tribes of Israel (vii. 4–8); but immediately after the account of the bringing in of this large but still finite number of Jews there follows: 'After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands.' And in the mouth of the redeemed is placed a new song unto the Lamb, 'who has redeemed them to God by His blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation' (v. 9). The Apocalypse is said to be Jewish, because the heavenly city is described under the name of the New Jerusalem (xxi. 2); but this is the very language of St. Paul in his most anti-Jewish Epistle—'Jerusalem, which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all' (Gal. iv. 26). For the literal

Jerusalem the Apocalypse has no more complimentary names than Sodom and Egypt (xi. 8).

I have already quoted the use made of the words 'those who say they are Jews, and are not'—words imagined to refer to St. Paul and his school. Those who give them this reference have read Paul's Epistles very carelessly, and have failed to notice one of his most characteristic traits. It is, that this Apostle, who combats so strenuously the notion that the Jew was to possess exclusive privileges in Christ's kingdom, and that circumcision was to be the condition of admission to it, still retained, as was natural in a Jew by birth, his attachment to the name of Jew and the name of circumcision. Educated as he had been to regard these as titles of honour, and to look down on the uncircumcised Gentile, it pains him to hear his disciples called by the name of the uncircumcision, and he contends that they were the true Jews—theirs the only true circumcision. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (ii. 11) he speaks of his Gentile followers as those 'who were called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh, made by hands.' He tells these Gentiles (Col. ii. 11), 'ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.' In the Epistle to the Philippians, when about to give to the Jews the name of the circumcision, he checks himself, and calls them instead the 'concision'; 'for we,' he says, 'are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh' (iii. 2). In the Epistle to the Galatians he claims for those who walk according to his rule the glorious title of the 'Israel of God' (vi. 16). And in a well-known passage in the Epistle to the Romans (ii. 28) the same doctrine is summed up. 'He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.'

I suppose there is no stronger mark of genuineness in Paul's Epistles, nor any trait less likely to have occurred to a forger, than this, that his affection for the names of Jew

and of circumcision clings to him long after he had ceased to attach any value to the things. It need not surprise us to find the same trait in St. John, who had grown up subject to the same influences; and we cannot hesitate to believe that those against whom the Seven Churches were warned were the unbelieving Jews, who are pronounced unworthy of the name of Jews, and whose synagogue is called the synagogue of Satan. It deserves to be mentioned that the Jews in Asia Minor long continued to be the most bitter adversaries of the Christian name, and that, when Polycarp was martyred, the Jews were most active in collecting materials for the pyre on which to burn him (Mart. S. Polyc. xiv., Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15).

As little need it be supposed that in those 'who say that they are apostles, and are not,' we must recognize St. Paul. Here again we have an exact parallel in St. Paul's Epistles: 'Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ' (2 Cor. xi. 13). And if any proof were needed of the falsity of the assertion that the Ephesian Church, ten years after St. Paul had founded it, rejected his claims to apostleship, it would be furnished by what immediately follows. For, according to Renan's hypothesis, the Church of Ephesus had at the commencement been beguiled into accepting Paul's pretensions, and therefore would be bound to look back with some shame and regret on its early simplicity. Is there any trace of this in the Apocalyptic Epistle? Nay; the first state of the Church is recalled as its palmy days. The Church is blamed for having left its first love, and commanded to remember whence it had fallen, and repent and do the first works (ii. 4, 5).

I must not omit to call attention to the extraordinary rapidity ascribed to the supposed counter-revolution in favour of Paulinism. For if we are to believe this theory the elder Apostles must have persevered to the end of their lives in treating Paul as an enemy. St. John, who was their last survivor, must have continued to hold up Paul and his disciples to odium after the death of the Apostle of the Gentiles. No one dates the Apocalypse earlier than the year 69, at which time, according to all tradition, Paul was dead. Up to that

time, therefore, those who might be regarded as having the best authority to speak had disowned Paul as a false Christian. Paul therefore must have died an excommunicated heretic. Yet, in a quarter of a century later—for that is now the received date of Clement's Roman Epistle—Paul is universally regarded as one of the chief of the Apostles, and as having been the cherished partner of Peter, both in work and in suffering! (Clem. Rom. 5.)

I have spent more time than you may have thought necessary in refuting an utterly baseless hypothesis; but my excuse is, that this hypothesis is treated as authentic history in almost all modern works in England, Germany, and France, which profess to give the latest results of critical science as applied to our sacred books.

IV.

RECEPTION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

Part I.

THE END OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

IRENÆUS, CLEMENT, AND TERTULLIAN.

IF I were lecturing on Christian Evidences, I should commence my examination of the books of the New Testament with the Epistles of St. Paul. There are some of these which are owned to be genuine by the most sceptical critics, and these universally admitted Epistles are rich in autobiographical details, and set Paul vividly before us as a real living, working character. In connexion with Paul's Epistles we should consider the book of the Acts of the Apostles, the latter half of which bears undeniable marks of having emanated from a companion of St. Paul. We have thus the fullest knowledge what Paul believed and taught, and to what sources of information he had access. We cannot doubt that Paul was thoroughly sincere in his belief of what he preached; and it is certain, also, that the central topic of his preaching was Christ's Resurrection. 'He is never weary of referring to this cardinal fact. He does not defend or prove it, but constantly assumes it as a fundamental fact about which no believer has any doubt whatever.' This fact which Paul receives so confidently was in his time only a few years old; and, without discussing Paul's claims to have himself seen his risen Master, it is unquestionable that he was on terms of intercourse with Peter, James, John, and

others who claimed to be original witnesses of the Resurrection. If we desire to know what else Paul taught concerning the events of our Saviour's life, we have the answer in St. Luke's Gospel, which is of indisputably common authorship with the Acts, and therefore proceeded from a member of Paul's company.

The order of taking the New Testament books which I have thus sketched offers some advantages, but, owing to inconveniences resulting from adopting it, which I will not delay to describe at length, I have fallen back on the obvious course of commencing with the Gospels. If we can establish that the Gospels contain the story told at the time by men who were eye-witnesses of what they related, and who confirmed their testimony by their sufferings, then, full of miracles as our Gospels are, it has been found practically impossible to refuse belief to them. But if the Gospels were written a hundred years or more after the events which they describe; if the story is not told by eye-witnesses, but has been improved by passing through several hands; if there has been time for floating myth and legend to gather round the simple facts, and for men's preconceived notions of what the Messiah ought to do, to ornament the history of what Jesus did; then the intrinsic improbability of every miraculous story outweighs second-hand testimony separated from the original witnesses by so long an interval. Of the two, however, it is a more vital matter with unbelievers to reject the early date of the Gospels than for us to assert it. Bring down the date of the Gospels as low as the most courageous of our adversaries can venture to bring them, and though we thus lose the proof of the greater part of the wonderful works of the Saviour's life, the great miracle of the Resurrection remains untouched. Take St. Paul's abridged account of the Gospel he had received, as given in an unquestioned Epistle (1 Cor. xv. 3–7), and, though it is so much shorter than any of the four, it contains quite as much stumbling-block for an anti-supernaturalist—'that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that He was seen of

above five hundred brethren at once ; after that He was seen of James, then of all the Apostles.' Thus, from Paul's writings and from other historical evidence, we can still show that men who could not easily have been deceived as to the truth of what they asserted, and who proved their sincerity by their readiness to face sufferings and martyrdom in attestation of their doctrine, declared that Jesus of Nazareth, the third day after He had died on the cross, rose again from the dead. If this one fact be proved, the cardinal principle of the anti-supernaturalists, the impossibility of miracle, is demolished. Christianity thus could survive the loss of the Gospels ; but infidelity is incompatible with the admission of them, as is evidenced by Strauss's confession, already quoted, that if the Gospels be recognized as historical sources, miracle cannot be eliminated from the life of Jesus.

In beginning our inquiry concerning the Gospels, I need not take you much later than, at the latest, the year 180. In every controversy it is always well to see what facts are undisputed which can be taken as common ground between the parties. Now, to use the words of Strauss, 'it is certain that, towards the end of the second century, the same four Gospels which we have still are found recognized in the Church, and are repeatedly quoted as the writings of the Apostles, and disciples of the Apostles, whose names they bear, by the three most eminent ecclesiastical teachers—Irenæus in Gaul, Clement in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Carthage. There were, indeed, current other Gospels, used not only by heretical parties, but sometimes appealed to by orthodox teachers —a Gospel of the Hebrews and of the Egyptians, a Gospel of Peter, of Bartholomew, of Thomas, of Matthias, of the Twelve Apostles—but the four were, at that time, and from that time downwards, considered as the peculiarly trustworthy foundation on which the Christian faith rested' (*Leben Jesu* § 10, p. 47). I will speak a little about each of these witnesses —viz. Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian. They are widely separated in space, and they represent the whole extent of the Christian world. They prove that, if there had been any previous doubt or uncertainty which of all the documents purporting to contain records of the Saviour's life were to be

regarded as of superior authority, that doubt had been removed before the end of the second century, and that the four Gospels which we recognize had then been established in the place of pre-eminence which they have held ever since.

Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons, in Gaul, about the year 180.* But Irenæus not only represents the testimony of the Gallican Church; he had been himself brought up in Asia Minor, from which country Gaul had, as we have every reason to believe, derived its Christianity as well as its early civilization. There remains (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 2) a most interesting record of the connexion between the two countries in an affecting narrative of the persecution of the year 177, addressed by the Christians of Vienne and Lyons to their brethren in Asia Minor. This Epistle, though it does not quote any of the books of the New Testament by name, is so full of passages in which the writer makes the language of these books his own—weaving texts into the narrative, as you constantly hear preachers doing at the present day—that we cannot doubt that the sacred books in use in that early Church were in the main the same as the books of our own New Testament. The bishop at the time of that persecution was Pothinus, a man of about ninety years of age, who must, therefore, have been born before some at least of the books of the New Testament were written, and who must have mixed with men contemporary with St. John. His presbyter and successor, Irenæus, was united by other links to the times of the Apostles. He tells us how well he remembered Polycarp,† whom in his early years he had known at Smyrna: 'I can recall the very place where Polycarp used to sit and teach, his manner of speech, his mode of life, his appearance, the style of his address to the people, his frequent references to St. John, and to others who had seen our Lord; how he used to repeat from memory their discourses, and the things

* Lipsius, in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' assigns A.D. 130 as the most probable date of the birth of Irenæus; and the period (180-188) as that in which it is likely that the different books of his treatise against heresies were published.

† Recent investigations determine A.D. 155 as the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp, at which time he was about eighty-six years old.

which he had heard from them concerning our Lord, His miracles, and His teaching; and how, being instructed himself by those who were eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, there was in all that he said a strict agreement with the Scriptures' (*Epistle to Florinus*, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 20). Observe this word 'Scriptures,' for it is plain that the books to which he gave this venerated title are those which contain the record of our Lord's life—the four Gospels.

There is a passage in the work of Irenæus against heresies which proves that he considered these books as, in the highest sense of the word, Scriptures given by inspiration of God. The passage is interesting as bearing testimony to a New Testament reading not found in our existing Greek manuscripts; but only in the Latin and in the Curetonian Syriac versions. It concerns the passage where we now read, in the opening of St. Matthew's Gospel, 'The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise' (i. 18). Irenæus is arguing against those who held that Jesus was at first but an ordinary man, and only became Christ when the Holy Spirit descended on Him in His baptism; and he remarks (III. xvi. 2) that Matthew might have said that 'the birth of *Jesus* was on this wise,' but that the Holy Spirit, foreseeing the depravers of the truth, and guarding against their fraud, said by Matthew, 'The birth of *Christ* was on this wise,'* showing that Christ was born; in other words, that Jesus was Christ from His birth. Thus what might seem the accidental choice of one form of expression rather than another is ascribed to the directing care of the Holy Spirit. You see then that Irenæus believed not only in the genuineness, but also in the inspiration, of the Gospels.

I dare say you have also heard of his reasons why there are exactly four Gospels, neither more nor less. He argues (III. xi. 8) that the Gospel is the pillar of the Church; the Church is spread over the whole world; the world has four quarters; therefore it is fitting there should also be four Gospels. Again, the Gospel is the divine breath, or wind of

* Potuerat dicere Matthaeus, 'Jesu vero generatio sic erat'; sed praevidens Spiritus Sanctus depravatores et praemuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthaeum ait 'Christi autem generatio sic erat.'

life for men; there are four chief winds; therefore, four Gospels. He builds another argument on the fourfold appearance of the cherubim. The cherubim, he says, are fourfold, and their faces are images of the activity of the Son of God. The first beast was like a lion, signifying His commanding and kingly dignity; the second like a calf, signifying His priestly office; the third like a man, denoting His Incarnation; the fourth like an eagle, denoting the Holy Spirit flying over the Church. Like these are the Gospels. John, who begins with the Godhead and descent from the Father, is the lion; Luke, who begins with the priesthood and sacrifice of Zacharias, is the calf; Matthew, who begins with His human genealogy, the man; Mark, the eagle, who commences with the announcement of the prophetic spirit—'the beginning of the Gospel as it is written by Isaiah the prophet.' You are aware, I dare say, that this is not the apportionment of the four beasts to the Gospels which ultimately prevailed in the West, John being usually represented as the eagle; Matthew as the man; Luke as the ox; and Mark as the lion.*

Irenæus goes on to say that Christ's dealings with the world are fourfold. To the patriarchs the word of God came directly; to those under the Law through the priestly office; Christ Himself came as man; since then He has dealt with the Church by His Spirit overshadowing the Church with His wings. Thus the Gospel also is fourfold, and those destroy its fundamental conception who make the number either greater or less; either desiring to seem to have found out more than the truth, or rejecting part of God's dispensation. The main point in this quotation is, that Irenæus considers the fourfold character of the Gospel to have been

* This apportionment seems to have been introduced into the West by St. Ambrose (*in Luc. Praef.* 8). It was made more widely known by St. Jerome, who professes therein to follow preceding expositors (*Praef. in. Matt.; in Ezek.* i. 6). St. Augustine (*De Consens. Evangg.* i. 9) adopts the same apportionment, except that he assigns the lion to St. Matthew, and the man to St. Mark. He mentions also the arrangement of Irenæus, but considers that this being founded merely on the manner in which the several Gospels begin, is inferior to an arrangement founded on their general contents. The three terrestrial animals, for instance, are fitly assigned to the three Gospels which are mainly occupied with our

divinely arranged. We are not concerned with the validity of his mystical explanations, but with the manifest inference that the pre-eminence of four Evangelists must have been, in the time of Irenæus, long established, else he would not thus ascribe it to divine appointment. Strauss quotes these mystical explanations of Irenæus with a view to disparage his testimony; but he is forced to admit that the fanciful character of his reasons why there are only four Gospels does not discredit his testimony to the fact that four, and only four, were then acknowledged by the universal Church; and he owns that the reasons given by Irenæus are not his grounds for receiving only four Gospels, but only his mode of justifying a belief adopted on other grounds.* Thus you see that, without producing a single other witness, we have proof that towards the end of the second century the Church held the belief that is commonly held by the Church of the present day, namely, that the four Gospels are to be venerated as inspired records of our Saviour's life, and that no others can be placed on a level with these.

Test by the evidence of this one witness the theory of some, that St. John's Gospel made its first appearance about the year 150 or 160. Is it credible that, if so, Irenæus could have accepted a forgery of which, according to the hypothesis, his master, Polycarp, had never told him a word? For Polycarp, who, as I said just now, used to repeat from memory the discourses which he had heard from John, could not have been silent about this work, which, if genuine, would be St. John's most precious legacy to the Church; and the fact that it had not been mentioned by Polycarp would convince Irenæus that it was an audacious imposture. And again, it is impossible that Polycarp could have accepted as genuine

---

Lord's earthly life: the eagle, to the spiritual Gospel of St. John, who soars above the clouds of human infirmity, and with unwavering eyes gazes on the light of immutable truth.

* 'Diese seltsame Beweisführung ist zwar nicht so zu verstehen, als wären die angegebenen Umstände der Grund gewesen, warum Irenäus nicht mehr und nicht weniger Evangelien annahm; vielmehr hatten sich diese vier eben damals in den Kreisen der nach Glaubenseinheit strebenden katholischen Kirche in vorzüglichen Credit gesetzt, und dieses gegebene Verhältniss suchte sich Irenäus im Geiste seiner Zeit zurechtzulegen (§ 10, p. 48).

a work of which he had never heard his master, John, speak. There are, in short, three links in the chain—St. John, Polycarp, Irenæus; and I do not see how it is possible to dissever any one of them from the other two.

Similar observations may be made about the conclusions of the author of the work called 'Supernatural Religion.' Other sceptical writers had thought they had done great things if they could bring John's Gospel as late as 150 or 160, allowing the Synoptic Gospels to date from the beginning of the century. This writer imagines that he has demolished all evidence for the existence of the Synoptic Gospels prior to the age of Irenæus, and will only allow them to count from the very end of the second century. But it is plain that the evidence of Irenæus, even if we had no other, takes us back a long way behind his own time. Books newly come into existence in his time could not have been venerated as he venerated the Gospels. What length of time must we allow for these books to have come into such esteem, that what might be regarded as their chance expressions should be considered as directed by the Spirit of God, and that among all the different attempts to relate the life of Christ none should seem fit to be put in comparison with these four? I suppose fifty years would be a very moderate allowance of time for such a growth of opinion: for the credit of these books mainly rested on a belief that they were of apostolic origin, and if they had been anywhere known to have been recent modifications of an older story, they could not have superseded their progenitors; so that we may fairly conclude that the time of their appearance was beyond then living memory. Well, then, what we have thus learned from Irenæus is of important use when we come presently to look at the works of the generation next before him. When we find in these works what seem to be quotations from our Gospels, we shall not easily be persuaded by small verbal differences that the writers are drawing from some unknown sources, and not from books which we are certain, from Irenæus, must in their time have existed, and have been of such credit in the Church as to be well known to these writers.

The second witness to whom I have appealed gives us the

verdict of another large portion of the Christian world. Clement* of Alexandria lived in what was perhaps the city in all the world where literary criticism was most cultivated. He had been there the disciple of Pantænus, who very possibly may have been personally connected with disciples of the Apostles. And Clement travelled and learned from other instructors of various nations, whose names he does not tell us, but only their nationalities, an Ionian, an Italian, a Syrian, an Egyptian, an Assyrian, a Hebrew in Palestine. 'These men,' as he says, 'preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching directly from Peter and James, from John and Paul, son receiving it from father, came by God's providence even to us, to deposit among us those seeds of truth which were derived from their ancestors and the Apostles' (*Strom.* i. 11). It is needless to quote particular passages from Clement: suffice it to say, that there is no more doubt as to his use of the Gospels than there is as to the place assigned them by any clergyman of the present day. He has traditions to tell concerning the composition of Mark's and of John's Gospel, both of which he regards as later than Matthew's and Luke's. That, like Irenæus, he recognized as authoritative four Gospels, neither more nor less, may be inferred from the manner in which he deals with a saying ascribed to our Lord (*Strom.* iii. 13)—'We have not this saying in the four Gospels which have been handed down to us; it is found in the Gospel according to the Egyptians† Besides this Gospel according to the Egyptians, he was acquainted with other apocryphal writings—a Gospel according to the Hebrews, Traditions of Matthias, and others; but the passage I have just cited is evidence enough that, in his estimation, no other account of the Saviour's deeds or words stood on the level of the four Gospels.

* Clement, possibly a Greek by birth, was born about the middle of the second century, and was head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria (192-202). We last hear of him as alive in 211 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11).

† Some have doubted whether Clement had himself seen the Gospel according to the Egyptians. He had said a little before that 'he thought' (οἶμαι) that the passage under discussion was to be found in the Gospel according to the Egyptians. It has been inferred, therefore, that this was either a book which he only knew by hearsay, or else one which it was so long since he had looked into, that he did not quite like to trust his memory in speaking of it.

When we compare the quotations of Clement and Irenæus a new phenomenon presents itself, which throws back the date of the Gospels still further behind their own times. We become aware of the existence of various readings. In fact, in some of the texts, where the reading is now controverted, there are second century witnesses on opposite sides. And the general type of the text in use in Alexandria was different from that in use in the West. Thus you see that the Gospels were not only in existence at the end of the second century, but they had by that time been copied and re-copied so often, that errors from transcription and otherwise had time to creep in, and different families of text to establish themselves.

The third witness to whom I have appealed, Tertullian,* also lived at the end of the second century, but represents a different section of the Church, the Latin-speaking section. Nothing need be said as to his use of the Gospels, about which there is as little question as to my own use of them, but it is worth while to call attention to the evidence his writings afford, that in his time they had already been translated into Latin. In fact he finds fault with the current Latin rendering of the first verse of St. John's Gospel, in which the word 'Logos' was translated by 'Sermo.'† Tertullian would have preferred 'Ratio.' I may say in passing that the difficulty here found by Tertullian—that of adequately rendering the Greek word 'Logos'—has been experienced by every translator of the New Testament. For 'Logos' not only means the spoken word—the only sense suggested by our English version—but still more, as Tertullian renders it, reason. And so the early Greek Fathers give the double sense to the term in the Prologue of St. John, inferring that

* The data for fixing the chronology of Tertullian's writings are scanty; but we shall not be far wrong in counting that he first appeared as a Church writer about 197, and that his literary activity continued some thirty years longer. His New Testament quotations have been collected by Rönsch, *Das neue Testament Tertullian's*. The quotations from the Gospels occupy over 200 pages, and if the Greek Gospels had not come down to us, we could from this source alone obtain a knowledge of far the greater portion of their contents.

† 'Jam in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis *Sermonem* dicere *in primordio apud deum fuisse* cum magis *rationem* competat antiquiorem haberi.' *Adv. Prax.* c. 5. Yet Tertullian himself habitually

it designates the Second Person of the Trinity not only as God's spoken Word, by which He made known His will to men, but also as having before this utterance dwelt from eternity with the Father; some analogy to help us to conceive such an indwelling being found in the dwelling in man of the principle of reason. So it is that the Fathers almost unanimously interpret the description of Wisdom in the 8th of Proverbs, of the Second Person of the Trinity, whom the Collect in daily use in our own College Chapel describes as 'the Eternal Wisdom of the Father.' This interpretation was received by the Arians as well as the orthodox.

Now this fact, that Tertullian criticized renderings which nevertheless he adopts in his own quotations, throws back the range of his testimony. We must allow some considerable time for a version to acquire such currency as to mould the popular theological dialect, and to give authority to renderings which were in the judgment of good scholars capable of improvement. Towards the end of the second century it is not only the fact that our Gospels are in sole possession all over the Christian world, but translations of them have gained an established rank. That is to say, at the time when it is doubted if our Gospels were born, we find their children in vigorous life.*

I believe, then, that if anyone fairly weighs all that is involved in the undisputed fact that Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian show that at the end of the second century all the principal books of our New Testament were received all over the civilized world as the works of the authors to whom we still ascribe them, he will own it to be unreasonable to demand

---

uses 'Sermo' as the equivalent for 'Logos,' and even in the same treatise (c. 20) when he formally quotes John i. 1, he does so in the form: 'In principio erat sermo et sermo erat apud deum et deus erat sermo. Hic erat in principio apud deum.' Another passage in which Tertullian appeals from the current Latin translation to the Greek original is (*De Monog.* c. 11.): 'Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem; *Si autem dormierit vir ejus*, quasi de futuro sonet, ac per hoc videatur ad eam pertinere quæ jam in fide virum amiserit.' But here again it is to be noted that Tertullian, when quoting the passage himself, conforms to common usage and does not introduce the correction which he suggests.

* See note at end of Lecture (p 44).

further evidence, when we do not dream of requiring such evidence in the case of any secular work.

The remains of the first generation of Christians are scanty, and of the few works that have come down to us, several are apologies intended for heathen readers,* to whom it would not be appropriate to cite the New Testament Scriptures. There is an advantage then in commencing with that age of which we have remains so full and abundant as to leave no room for controversy as to the sentiments of the writers; and which at the same time is so near the age of the Apostles, that what was then the undisputed established opinion as to the authorship of their sacred books, held by common consent of distant Churches, is very likely to be a true opinion. Should a question arise some centuries hence whether Pope wrote the 'Dunciad' and the 'Rape of the Lock,' or whether Goldsmith wrote the 'Deserted Village' and the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' it would go far to settle the question, if it were proved that in our generation no doubt was entertained by anyone on the matter, even if all preceding testimony had perished.

Though, in my opinion, the testimony of the three witnesses already considered might suffice to produce conviction, we can produce trustworthy evidence of considerably earlier date, which will be the subject of future Lectures.

Note.

Scholars had generally agreed in inferring from the evidence here appealed to that there existed in the time of Tertullian a Latin translation that was in general use in Africa. This inference has been lately contested by Zahn *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, 1888, I. 35, *sq.* He admits that the reading of the Gospels then formed part of the service at Christian meetings

* From the nature of the case, references to the New Testament books are infrequent in works addressed to such readers; for example, if only Tertullian's 'Apology' had come down to us it would not have been possible to prove that he was acquainted with the Gospels.

for worship; but he contends that this did not necessitate a Latin Bible. Irenæus preached to the Celts of Gaul, but we do not hear of a Celtic Bible. We do not hear of any Punic Bible in Africa, though Christianity made many converts among those who spoke no other language. He points out that in the Jewish Synagogues the Bible was read in Hebrew, and then orally interpreted to those who did not understand the ancient language, and he cites two or three examples of a similar use of interpreters in the Christian Church. In his opinion then the needs of those who spoke no other language than Latin were at first met, not by any authorized Latin version of Scripture, but by independent oral interpretation at the Christian meetings. It may readily be conceded that, as has been often remarked, the Gospel was introduced into Rome in the colony of Jews or other foreign settlers whose ordinary language was Greek, whom Paul addressed in Greek in the Epistle to the Romans, for whose use, according to early tradition, the Greek Gospel of St. Mark was written, and whose liturgical service no doubt was Greek. Nor would such a service be unintelligible when converts were made among native Romans of higher rank; for a knowledge of Greek was the ordinary accomplishment of a Roman gentleman. This was equally true of Africa, as Zahn illustrates from the martyrdom of Perpetua, a document not much later than the year 200. Perpetua was a lady of good position, 'honeste nata, liberaliter instituta, matronaliter nupta.' When converts of lower rank came in, it is extremely credible that the transition from liturgical service in Greek to liturgical service in Latin was bridged over by liturgical service in Greek accompanied by Latin oral interpretation. The only question is at what epoch the transition took place, and Zahn gives no sufficient evidence that a Latin service had not been fully established in the time of Tertullian. He himself admits that the context indicates that the 'agios, agios, agios,' in the martyrdom of Perpetua was derived directly from the Book of Revelation rather than from liturgical use; but in any case it is quite conceivable that an African Latin Liturgy might retain these words in the original. At any rate, though the method of interpretation would enable persons ignorant of Greek to

join intelligently in a Greek service, it presupposes clergy able to interpret. Now, though the clergy who at the end of the second century ministered to Celtic or Punic congregations are likely to have known enough *either* of Greek or Latin to enable them to interpret, it is not likely that Greek alone would have sufficed, or that those who ministered to rural congregations in Africa would all be such good Greek scholars as to be able to dispense with a Latin Bible. Another weak point in Zahn's comparison is that Celtic was not a literary language, and the rude people who spoke it might easily be content with such portions of Scripture as they could hear read in Church; but among Latin-speaking Christians there would be many of such literary cultivation as to wish to read as well as hear the Scripture.

A much stronger point in Zahn's case is that Tertullian himself repeatedly quotes directly from the Greek, and not from a Latin version, as we can tell from his translating the same passage in different ways. This has been noticed before: see for example Hort (*N. T.*, ii. 78). Tertullian was a good Greek scholar, who could not only read that language, but had even written some tracts in it. It is to be noted that far the larger part of instances of his direct use of the Greek Testament occur in his work against Marcion. Now Tertullian must have written that work with his Greek Testament open before him, for Tertullian's object was to maintain the true text of New Testament passages which Marcion had falsified or omitted; and as Marcion's work was certainly in Greek, it must have been with the Greek original that he compared it. Tertullian's other citations require careful examination, but I may remark that Zahn is willing (p. 58) to make an admission fatal to his case in conceding that Tertullian was acquainted with the Latin translation of Irenæus. The proofs of this offered by Massuet in the prolegomena to his edition of Irenæus have been accepted by many scholars as sufficient, but certainly need further sifting. But we may dismiss as quite incredible Zahn's idea (p. 58) that Latin-speaking Christians demanded a translation of the work of Irenæus, and of other pieces of Greek literature, before they cared to have a translation of their Greek Bible. If the

resemblances between Tertullian and the Latin translation of Irenæus are enough to prove that Tertullian was acquainted with this translation, the differences are certainly enough to prove that, notwithstanding, he constantly preferred, instead of using it, to translate for himself. However, the question is not whether Tertullian himself used a Latin translation of the Bible—a thing which we readily grant he had no need to do—but whether he bears testimony to the existence of such a thing in his time. Now it seems to me that the practice of a number of independent interpreters, each in his own Church, could never have sufficed to establish such a 'use' as that which is attested in the passages already cited. If Tertullian or anyone else did not like the interpretation given by his neighbours, he would have felt himself perfectly free to give a better one of his own. I am, therefore, not prepared to abandon the hitherto received opinion that in the time of Tertullian a Latin translation existed in writing. Put the matter, however, at the lowest, and it is certain that in his time the Latin translation, whether known orally through the work of different interpreters or by writing, had assumed a definite form, so as to constitute an established use. So that my assertion remains true, that in the time of Tertullian not only the Gospels existed but their children, the only disputable point being whether or not the latter had attained their full growth.

V.

Part II.

MURATORIAN FRAGMENT. CAIUS—HIPPOLYTUS.

It would take more time than I can ask you to give, if I were to bring before you all the second century testimonies to the Gospels; and I had intended to go back at once from the three witnesses whose testimony is admitted by Strauss to Justin Martyr, who lived about the middle of the second century; but I see that to do this would oblige me to omit some

things of which I think you ought to be told, and with which I mean to occupy the present Lecture. I call your attention, in the first place, to a very interesting document, commonly known as the Muratorian Fragment on the Canon. It is a list of the books accepted at its date as authoritative, and it is called Muratorian, because first published, in the year 1740, by the Italian scholar Muratori, from a manuscript now, as then, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, but which had originally belonged to the great Irish monastery of Bobbio. This manuscript is a collection of extracts from various authors, made about the eighth century, and the particular extract with which we have now to deal must have been made from what was then a mutilated manuscript, which the transcriber was desirous to preserve; for the existing manuscript is quite perfect—no leaves are lost; but the extract begins in the middle of a sentence, and ends quite as abruptly. It bears marks of having been a rude translation from the Greek; and the transcriber was clearly a very indifferent Latin scholar, for his work is full of misspellings and other blunders, such as in some places quite to obscure the meaning. In fact, it was as a specimen of such blundering that Muratori first published it.

So much interest attaches to this extract, as containing the earliest extant attempt to give anything like a formal list of New Testament books, that I must not grudge the time necessary for laying before you the internal evidence which approximately fixes the date of the composition of the work from which the extract was taken.* In reading Paley's 'Evi-

* A monograph on the Muratorian Fragment was published by Tregelles in 1867. Considerable additional light was thrown on it by Dr. Westcott, the results of whose study of it are given in the appendix to his *New Testament Canon*, p. 514. As I have frequently occasion to refer to this Fragment, it is convenient to print it here entire, as restored by Westcott; but it will be observed that some passages are too corrupt to be restored with certainty. For a transcript of the actual text I refer to Westcott's *New Testament Canon*, and for other sources of information to my article, MURATORIAN FRAGMENT, in Smith's 'Dictionary of Christian Biography.'

. . . quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit. Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucan, Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi, cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset, nomine suo ex opinione conscripsit. Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne, et idem

dences' last year you must have become familiar at least with the name of the 'Shepherd of Hermas.' This work is quoted as inspired by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria; and in the third century Origen hazarded the conjecture that it might have been written by Hermas, who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans; and this, though, as I say, a comparatively late conjecture, has been accepted by some as if it were tradition. The Muratorian Fragment gives a different account of the authorship, and one which has all the air of being tradition, and not conjecture. It would appear that, at the time this fragment was written, there was some disposition to accept the 'Shepherd' as canonical; for, in a passage where, notwithstanding corruption of text, the writer's general meaning can be clearly made out, he lays down that this book may be read, but not be publicly used, with the Apostles and Prophets, whose number is complete, seeing that it was written 'very recently in our own time by Hermas, while his brother Pius sat in the chair of the See of Rome.' Now, the date when Pius was Bishop of Rome is variously given; those who place him latest make him bishop between 142-157; so the question as to the date of the fragment is, How long after

---

prout assequi potuit, ita et a nativitate Johannis incepit dicere. Quarti evangeliorum Johannes ex discipulis. Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit, conjejunate mihi hodie triduum et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutrum nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte revelatum Andreæ ex apostolis, ut recognoscentibus cunctis Johannes suo nomine cuncta describeret. Et ideo licet varia singulis Evangeliorum libris principia doceantur, nihil tamen differt credentium fidei, cum uno ac principali Spiritu declarata sint in omnibus omnia de nativitate, de passione, de resurrectione, de conversatione cum discipulis suis ac de gemino ejus advento, primum in humilitate despectus, quod fuit, secundum potestate regali præclarum, quod futurum est. Quid ergo mirum si Johannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat dicens in semetipsum, 'Quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audivimus et manus nostræ palpaverunt, hæc scripsimus.' Sic enim non solum visorem, sed et auditorem, sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordinem profitetur.

Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophilo comprendit, quia sub præsentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed et profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.

Epistulæ autem Pauli, quia, a quo loco, vel qua ex causa directæ sint, volentibus intellegere ipsæ declarant. Primum omnium Corinthiis schisma hæresis interdicens, deinceps Galatis circumcisionem, Romanis autem ordine scripturarum, sed et principium earum esse Christum intimans, prolixius scripsit; de quibus singulis necesse est a nobis disputari, cum

could a writer fairly describe this period as 'nuperrime temporibus nostris'? It is urged that we cannot well make this interval much more than twenty years. I have been accustomed to speak of the definition of the dogma of Papal Infallibility at the Vatican Council of 1870 as very recent, and as an event of our own time, though I begin to doubt whether I can go on much longer with propriety in using such language; but though the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1852 is also an event of my own time, you would think it strange if I called it very recent, seeing that it occurred before most of you were born. It is concluded, therefore, that the date of this fragment cannot be much later than 170.

There is, however, great difficulty in finding any writer of that date to whom it can be plausibly assigned, especially as internal evidence limits us to Rome or Italy as the place of composition. This consideration sets aside a very improbable guess of the late Baron Bunsen—Hegesippus, commonly called, but probably incorrectly, the earliest ecclesiastical historian. The extracts from his work which have been preserved by Eusebius, and by which alone he is now known,

---

ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus, sequens prodecessoris sui Johannis ordinem nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali; ad Corinthios (prima), ad Ephesios (secunda), ad Philippenses (tertia), ad Colossenses (quarta), ad Galatas (quinta), ad Thessalonicenses (sexta), ad Romanos (septima). Verum Corinthiis et Thessalonicensibus licet pro correptione iteretur, una tamen per omnem orbem terræ ecclesia diffusa esse dinoscitur; et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi, licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit. Verum ad Philemonem unam, et ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum duas, pro affectu et dilectione; in honore tamen ecclesiæ catholicæ in ordinatione ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ sanctificatæ sunt. Fertur etiam ad Laodicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine finctæ ad hæresim Marcionis, et alia plura, quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest: fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.

Epistula sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duas in Catholica habentur; et Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta.

Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente cathedra urbis Romæ Ecclesiæ Pio Episcopo fratre ejus; et ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in Ecclesia populo, neque inter prophetas, completum numero, neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest.

Arsinoi autem seu Valentini vel Metiad [ ] nihil in totum recipimus. Qui etiam novum psalmorum librum Marcioni conscripserunt, una cum Basilide, Assiano Cataphrygum constitutorem . . .

though historical in their character, are thought by the best recent critics more likely to have been taken from a doctrinal or controversial book than from a regular history. Hegesippus lived about the right time, but he had no connexion with Italy: and besides, since Eusebius tells us that in the passages he cites from earlier writers he had particularly in view to illustrate the testimony borne by them to the New Testament Scriptures (*H. E.*, iii. 3), I count it improbable that, if Eusebius had found in Hegesippus so remarkable an enumeration of books owned as canonical, he would not have made some mention of it. Muratori himself, when he published the fragment, conjectured as its author Caius, the Roman presbyter; and there is vastly more to be said for that guess than for Bunsen's. Caius was the author of a dialogue against the Montanists. The dialogue has been lost, but Eusebius (*H. E.*, vi. 20) tells us that, in rebuking the rashness and impudence of the Montanists in composing new Scriptures, he counts only thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, omitting that to the Hebrews. Thus it seems certain that this lost dialogue contained a list of canonical books, which Caius set down, intending by this closed Canon to exclude Montanist additions. It is natural to ask, then, May not this Muratorian list be the very list of Caius? Like that, it was drawn up at Rome; and like that also, it only counts thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, leaving out the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the date has been thought a fatal objection. Caius wrote in the episcopate of Zephyrinus—we may say about the year 210; how, then, could he speak of the year 140 or 150 as very recent? The objection is a serious, but I do not count it a fatal one. When a writer is only known to us by a single fragment, we have no means of judging of his habitual carefulness in the use of language, and so we are not safe in considering ourselves bound to put the strictest interpretation on his words. Instances have been produced where similar expressions have been used about events which happened a century or two ago. Everything is comparative. We should call Luther and Calvin quite modern writers if anyone imagined them to be contemporary with St. Augustine. Although, as I said just now, I should not dream, in ordinary

conversation, of describing an event of the year 1852 as quite recent; yet, if I were writing controversially, and contrasting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception with the articles of the Apostles' Creed, it would not be in the least unnatural if I described the former as a dogma formulated 'quite recently and in our own time.' And I might say this even if the promulgation of the doctrine had been fifty years earlier than it was. Why, even Pope Pius's Creed, which was made some three hundred years ago, is often spoken of as quite new when it is put in comparison with the Nicene Creed. Now, the object of Caius (as described by Eusebius) and of the author of the fragment clearly was controversial; it was to draw a broad line of separation between the inspired writings of the Apostolic age and modern additions; and, therefore, we need not press too closely the energetic language with which the author of the fragment protests against placing on a level in Church reading with the Sacred Scriptures a writing that he believed to be no older than Pope Pius I.

Now a careful examination of the 'Shepherd of Hermas' has quite convinced me that, instead of being a work of the middle of the second century, it dates from its very beginning. If the Muratorian writer has made a mistake about the date of Hermas, it is likely he was not so near a contemporary of Pius as people have thought. I have also found reason, on investigating the history of Montanism, which clearly is combated in the Muratorian fragment, to think that it did not make its appearance in the West until a little after the year 200. On these and other grounds* I came to the conclusion that the fragment is of the same age as the dialogue of Caius; and, then, I did not think I could fairly refuse to accept Muratori's hypothesis, although I had myself proposed to ascribe the fragment to Caius's contemporary Hippolytus, being led to that idea by finding the same note about the authorship of the 'Shepherd' in an early list of Roman bishops which I believe to be derived from Hippolytus.† Further, the whole tone of the fragment is rather didactic than controversial—

* See Smith's 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' ARTS, MURATORIAN FRAGMENT and MONTANISM.

† *Hermathena*, I. 125 (1874).

rather the lesson of a master to disciples than of a disputant with opponents, so that it scarcely seemed likely to have come from the dialogue against the Montanists. But though I accepted the Caius hypothesis for a time, a new difficulty has since arisen. Very little had been known of Caius, but Dr. Gwynn has lately (*Hermathena*, 1888), recovered some fragments of his writings which leave no doubt that Caius rejected the Apocalypse of St. John, a work accepted in the Muratorian fragment. I return, therefore, to my former opinion that Hippolytus was probably the author of the work of which this fragment formed a part.

I have frankly told you my own opinion, but you must remember this is only my individual notion, and that the received doctrine of scholars (orthodox and sceptical alike) is that the document is not later than 170 or 180. It is a pity that the impossibility of laying before you any view but that which, however mistakenly, I believe to be true, obliges me both to be guilty of the immodesty of setting myself in opposition to the received opinion of scholars, and also to forego the controversial advantage that arises from accepting the date commonly ascribed to the fragment. According to that date we gain a witness to our Canon, who, if not many years earlier than Irenæus, would be at least an elder contemporary: according to my view, he is but a younger contemporary (for both Caius and Hippolytus* are said to have been disciples of Irenæus), and the main value of the fragment is the testimony it gives to the wide line of distinction that at that early date was drawn between canonical books and the most valued of uninspired writings. I shall frequently have occasion to refer to this document in the course of these Lectures. At present I will merely report the account it gives of the Gospels.

The fragment begins with a few words which evidently are the end of a description of St. Mark's Gospel, for it proceeds to describe what it calls the third book of the Gospels, that by Luke, whom it states to have been a companion of Paul, but not to have himself seen our Lord in the flesh,

* These writers were both leading members of the Church of Rome in the first quarter of the third century. It is likely that each may have commenced his literary activity before the end of the second.

mention being made that he commenced his history from the nativity of John the Baptist. The fourth Gospel it states to have been written by St. John on the suggestion of his fellow-disciples and bishops (by which, I suppose, is meant the other Apostles), whereupon John proposed that they should all fast three days, and tell each other whatever might be revealed to any, and it was the same night revealed to Andrew that, under the revision of all, John should in his own name write an account of everything. Wherefore, it adds, although the teaching of the separate books be diversified, it makes no difference to the faith of believers, since in all, by one guiding Spirit, are declared all things concerning our Lord's Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, conversation with His disciples, and concerning His double Advent—the first in humility, which is past; the second in royal majesty, which is still to come.* Thus full and clear is the testimony of the latter half of the second century, not only to the

* It would be interesting if there were clear evidence that the work from which our fragment was taken was read by any ancient author. I think it, therefore, worth while to copy the account which St. Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on St. Matthew, gives of the four Gospels, because the coincidences with our fragment, which I have marked in Italics, seem to me more than accidental. 'Primus omnium Matthæus est publicanus, cognomento Levi, qui Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo sermone edidit: ob eorum vel maxime caussam, qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judæis, et nequaquam legis umbram, succedente Evangeli veritate servabant. Secundus Marcus, interpres Apostoli Petri, et Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ primus episcopus; *qui Dominum Salvatorem ipse non vidit,* sed ea quæ magistrum audierat prædicantem, juxta fidem magis gestorum narravit quam ordinem. *Tertius Lucas medicus,* natione Syrus Antiochensis, cujus laus in Evangelio, *qui et ipse discipulus Apostoli Pauli,* in Achaiæ Bœotiæque partibus volumen condidit, quædam altius repetens: et ut ipse in procemio confitetur audita magis quam visa describens. Ultimus Johannes Apostolus et Evangelista, quem Jesus amavit plurimum; qui supra pectus Domini recumbens, purissima doctrinarum fluenta potavit, et qui solus de cruce meruit audire, Ecce mater tua. Is quum esset in Asia, et jam tunc hæreticorum semina pullularent, Cerinthi, Ebionis, et cæterorum qui negant Christum in carne venisse (quos et ipse in Epistola sua Antichristos vocat, et Apostolus Paulus frequenter percutit), *coactus est ab omnibus pene tunc Asiæ episcopis et multarum ecclesiarum legationibus* de divinitate salvatoris altius scribere; et ad ipsum (ut ita dicam) Dei Verbum, non tam audaci, quam felici temeritate prorumpere. Et ecclesiastica narrat historia, quum a fratribus cogeretur ut scriberet, *ita facturum se respondisse si indicto jejunio omnes Deum precarentur,* quo expleto, revelatione saturatus, in illud procemium cœlo veniens eructavit: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum; Hoc erat in principio apud Deum.

genuineness of the four Gospels, but to their inspiration. If nothing more could be adduced, it is better evidence than that which satisfies us in the case of most classical writers.

As I have had occasion to mention these two disciples of Irenæus—Caius and Hippolytus—I have a few words more to say about each. In point of antiquity they may be regarded as on a level with Clement and Tertullian, though but younger contemporaries of Irenæus. And I may say in passing, that the long continuance of a large Greek element in the Roman Church is testified by the fact, that although Caius and Hippolytus both held office in that Church in the first quarter of the third century, all that remains of either is in Greek; and Hippolytus published so many Greek books, including some sermons, that I am not without doubts whether he could use Latin at all for literary purposes.

In speaking of Irenæus, I mentioned that he builds an argument on the words of a text in St. Matthew's Gospel, in such a way as to show that he was a believer in the verbal inspiration of the Evangelist: that is to say, that he looked on the choice by the Evangelist of one word rather than another as a matter to be regarded not as due to the accidental caprice of the human writer, but as directed and overruled by the Holy Spirit. It is plain that anyone who holds such an opinion about any book must feel himself bound to see that special care shall be used in the transcription of it, in order that no copyist may carelessly or wilfully substitute words of his own for the words dictated by the Holy Ghost. It is notorious with what care the Massoretic text of the Old Testament has been preserved by men who thought that a mystery might lie in every word, every letter of the sacred text. What kind of care was used in the time of Irenæus we may gather from an interesting adjuration which he prefixed to a work of his own—'Whosoever thou art who shalt transcribe this book, I charge thee with an oath by our Lord Jesus Christ and by His glorious appearing, in which He cometh to judge the quick and dead, that thou carefully compare what thou hast transcribed, and correct it according to this copy whence thou hast transcribed it; and that thou transcribe this oath in like manner, and place it in thy copy' (Euseb.,

H. E., v. 20) We may safely assume that Irenæus would be solicitous that fully as much care and reverence should be used in perpetuating the text of the Gospels, which he venerated so highly; and we may, therefore, regard the end of the second century as a time when a check was being put on the licentiousness of scribes in introducing variations into the text of the New Testament writings. It is in reference to this point that I think it worth while to make a quotation from Caius. Eusebius (*H. E.*, v. 28) has preserved some extracts from a work directed against the followers of Artemon, who, of those calling themselves Christians, was amongst the earliest to hold our Blessed Lord to have been mere man. Internal evidence shows the work to belong to the beginning of the third century, and it has been ascribed both to Caius and Hippolytus; but the greater weight of critical authority, and, in my opinion, also far the greater weight of evidence, is in favour of the ascription to Caius. The writer pronounces the doctrine of our Lord's simple humanity to be in contradiction to the Holy Scriptures; and it is plain, from the nature of the case, that the writings which he thus describes as Holy Scriptures, and as teaching the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, must have been Scriptures of the New Testament. But from a later part of the same writing, it appears that the subject of various readings had, at that early date, given rise to controversy. Caius accuses his opponents of having tampered with the Holy Scriptures, of having published what they called 'corrected' copies, but which, in his judgment, were simply ruined. He appeals to the fact that different 'correctors' did not agree among themselves, and that the same man was not always consistent with himself, his later text being often at variance with his earlier; and he adds: 'I think they can hardly be ignorant themselves what impudent audacity their offence involves. For either they do not believe the Divine Scriptures to have been spoken by the Holy Spirit, and then they are nothing but infidels; or else they think that they are wiser than the Holy Spirit, and who could entertain such an idea but a demoniac?' We have not the means of judging whether the anger of Caius was justly roused by perversions of the sacred text, wilfully made in

order to remove its testimony to our Lord's Divinity, or whether he was but the blind champion of a Textus Receptus against more learned critical revisers. The important point for us to observe is how strongly the doctrine of Scripture Inspiration was held at the beginning of the third century; and you will see how well justified I am in thinking it needless, in our investigation about the Gospels, to go below the age of Irenæus, the tradition which he handed on to his disciples being identical with that which the Church has held ever since.

It might seem, then, needless to say anything about Hippolytus, whose literary activity mainly belonged to the first quarter of the third century; and so it would be needless, if the question were merely about his own opinions; but the chief value of Hippolytus consists in the information he has preserved to us about the sentiments of earlier writers, and these, men whose testimony is of high value to us in the present investigation, namely, the heretics of the second century.

We are never so secure that a tradition has been transmitted to us correctly as when it comes through different independent channels. For example, to touch by anticipation on subjects on which I shall have to speak at more length in other courses of Lectures, the value of a version as a witness in any controversy respecting the true text of the sacred writings depends on the facts that the version is, for all essential purposes, a duplicate of the manuscript from which the translation was made, and that the corruptions which the two will suffer in the process of transcription are likely to be different, since words resembling each other in one language will probably not correspond to words easily interchanged in the other. Hence things in which the version and copies of the original agree may safely be counted to be as old as the time when the translation was made. In like manner, if, in any investigation as to the liturgical usages of the Eastern Church, we find details of Eucharistic celebration common to the Catholics, the Nestorian, and the Eutychian sects, we may safely reckon these details to be at least as ancient as the time when the splitting off of these sects took place; for

the simple reason, that it is very unlikely that anything subsequently introduced in one of mutually hostile communities would be adopted by the other. Similarly, if we find books enjoying the prerogatives of Scripture in orthodox Churches and heretical sects alike, we may safely conclude that these books had gained their position before the separation of the heretical sects in question. A forgery of later date would not be likely to be accepted by both alike, and to be treated as common ground on which both could argue.

The work of Hippolytus, which has thrown a great deal of light on the Gnostic speculations of the second century, has only become known in my own time, having been preserved in only a single manuscript, which was brought from Mount Athos to Paris, and published for the first time in 1851. The title is the 'Refutation of all Heresies.' The method of refutation which Hippolytus principally employed is one which is very convenient to us, and probably was quite enough for his orthodox readers. It consisted in simply repeating the heretics' doctrine in their own words, the object being to exhibit its identity with heathen speculations. In this way we obtain a knowledge of several heretical writings, of which, except through this book of Hippolytus, we should not have heard. Now common to all these writings is the copious use as authoritative of our four Gospels, and in particular of that Gospel whose date has been brought down lowest, the Gospel according to St. John. We do not gain much by these citations when the heretics quoted are only known to us by the extracts given by Hippolytus; for then it is open to any objector to say, Oh! perhaps these writers were contemporary with Hippolytus himself, or very little older. Who can assure us that the heretical documents dragged to light by Hippolytus had been in circulation for a dozen years before he exposed them? But the heretics from whose works Hippolytus gives extracts are not all of them unknown persons. I name in particular Basilides and Valentinus, who hold a prominent place in the lists of everyone who has written about the heretics of the second century. Basilides taught in the reign of Hadrian—let us say about the year 130—and Valentinus taught in Rome between the years 140 and 150. In fact,

both these schools of heretics are mentioned by Justin Martyr, so that they clearly belong to the first half of the second century, and chronologically come before Justin Martyr, of whom I had proposed next to speak. Now in the extracts given by Hippolytus purporting to be from Basilides and Valentinus, each of these writers not only quotes from Paul's Epistles (including that to the Ephesians, one doubted by Renan, who accepts all the rest, except the Pastoral Epistles), but each also makes use of the Gospels, in particular of the Gospel according to St. John. I may say in passing, that though the fourth Gospel is that which is most assailed by sceptical writers, yet as far as external evidence is concerned, if there be any difference between this Gospel and the others, the difference is in its favour—that is to say, I think there is even greater weight of external attestation to this than to the rest. And the use made of St. John's Gospel by all the heretics of the second century is no small argument in favour of its early date. The answer made by sceptical writers to these quotations in Hippolytus is, Can you be sure that the Valentinian and Basilidian works from which Hippolytus quotes were really written by the heresiarchs themselves? Is it not possible that, when he professes to describe the opinions of Valentinus or Basilides, he is drawing his information from the work of some disciple of each of these sects who lived nearer his own time, the φησί with which Hippolytus introduces the quotations being merely intended to have the effect of inverted commas in an English book, and not to be pressed to mean that Valentinus himself is the speaker? If I were to deal with this answer in a controversial spirit I might describe it as a quite gratuitous assumption, and a mere evasion to escape a difficulty, to imagine that Hippolytus can mean anything but what he says, or to suppose that words which he distinctly states are those of Valentinus are to be understood as spoken by somebody else. But I should be sorry to press any argument the least degree further than in my own heart I considered it would justly bear; and when I ask myself whether I can say that I regard Hippolytus as incapable of the laxity here imputed to him, I cannot say that I do. I do not think highly

of his critical acumen, and I cannot pronounce it impossible that he may have erroneously accepted or described a Valentinian book as the work of Valentinus himself. I therefore do not insist on the admission that the heretical works cited are as old as the words of Hippolytus, literally understood, would make them out to be; and for my purpose I can be quite satisfied with the incontrovertible fact that, in the time of Hippolytus, there was no controversy between the Valentinians and the orthodox as to their New Testament Canon, and in particular that the Gospel of John was alike venerated by both parties.

This is a fact which we can abundantly establish by other evidence. The whole vocabulary of the system of Valentinus is founded on the prologue to St. John's Gospel. The system of Valentinus uses as technical words, *μονογενής*, *ζωή*, *ἀληθεία*, *χάρις*, *πλήρωμα*, *λόγος*, *φῶς*. It is quite impossible to invert the order, and to suppose these words first to have been the key-words of a heretical system, and then to have been borrowed by someone desirous to pass himself off as St. John, or to suppose that in such a case the Gospel could ever have found acceptance in the Church. You might as well conceive someone who wanted a document to be accepted as authoritative by us Protestants, stuffing it with Roman Catholic technical words — Transubstantiation, Purgatory, and such like. Putting in such words would clearly show any Protestant that the document emanated from a hostile body; and so, in like manner, if the theory of Valentinus had been promulgated before the publication of the fourth Gospel, the vocabulary of the prologue to that Gospel would have excluded it from Catholic use. There is abundance of other evidence that Catholics and Valentinians were agreed as to the reverence paid to this Gospel. Tertullian contrasts the methods of dealing with the New Testament pursued by Marcion, of whom I shall speak a little later, and by Valentinus. Marcion mutilated his New Testament, rejecting all parts of it which he could not reconcile with his theories; but Valentinus, as Tertullian says, 'integro instrumento uti videtur' (*De Præscrip.* 38); that is to say, he did not reject the Gospels accepted by the Catholic Church, but he strove by

artificial interpretation to make them teach his peculiar doctrine. How true this statement is we have extant evidence. The earliest commentary on a New Testament book of which we have any knowledge is by a heretic—that by the Valentinian Heracleon on St. John. It is known to us through the use made of it by Origen, who, when commenting on the same book, quotes Heracleon some fifty times, sometimes agreeing with him, but more usually controverting him. We have thus a very minute knowledge of Heracleon's commentary on at least four or five chapters of St. John. And this characteristic prevails throughout, that the strongest believer in verbal inspiration at the present day could not dwell with more minuteness on the language of St. John, or draw more mysteries from what might seem the accidental use of one expression rather than another.

There is controversy as to the date of Heracleon. All we know with certainty is, that he must have been earlier than Clement of Alexandria, who quotes him twice (*Strom.* IV. 9; *Eclog. ex Scrip. Proph.* 25). Sceptical writers make Heracleon as little earlier than Clement as they can help, and say his commentary may have been as late as 180. Orthodox writers would give it thirty or forty years greater antiquity. For my part, I think it makes little difference as far as the question of the antiquity of St. John's Gospel is concerned. Heracleon was a Valentinian, and it appears that in his time the authority, and I think we may say the inspiration, of John's Gospel was common ground to the Valentinians and the Catholics. How could that be possible, if it had not been acknowledged before the Valentinians separated from the orthodox? If the book had been written, subsequently to the separation, by a Valentinian, the orthodox would not have received it; if by a Catholic the Valentinians would not have received it. If it had been of unknown parentage, it is incredible that both communities should have accepted it as Apostolic.

What has been said about Valentinus may be repeated about Basilides. Hippolytus produces an extract in which the words of St. John's Gospel are twice quoted (vii. 22, 27), and which he says, as plain as words can do it, is taken from

a writing of Basilides.* Admit that Hippolytus was either misinformed on this point, or through inaccuracy said what he did not mean to say, it still remains that the extract was written by at least a disciple of Basilides. It follows that Basilidians and orthodox agreed in their reverence for St. John's Gospel; and it follows, then, by the same argument which I have used already, that St. John's Gospel must have gained its authority before Basilides separated from the Church—that is to say, at least before 130. This evidence for the antiquity of St. John is an argument *a fortiori* for the antiquity of the other Gospels, which all admit to be earlier.

I may here mention the only point of any consequence on which a difference is attempted to be made between the testimony to the fourth Gospel and to the others, viz. that though Papias, of whom I will speak presently, names Matthew and Mark as the authors of Gospels, and though there are early anonymous quotations of John's Gospel, the first to mention John by name as its author is Theophilus, who was bishop of Antioch about 170 (*ad Autol.*, ii. 22). But this point is of very small worth; for not to say that the argument might be used equally against Luke's Gospel, the authorship of which is not seriously contested, there cannot be a doubt that any evidence which proves the antiquity of John's Gospel proves also its authorship. In other words, it is plain from the work itself that whoever composed it intended it to be received as emanating from the beloved disciple; and we cannot doubt that it was as such it was received by those who did accept it. Let me call your attention to the singular fact, that the name of the Apostle John is never mentioned in St. John's Gospel. If you had only that Gospel, you would never know that there was an Apostle of the name. The other Gospels, when they speak of the forerunner of our Lord, always give him the title of the Baptist, so as to prevent confusion between the two

* Westcott *New Testament Canon*, p. 288) gives strong reasons for believing the extract to be from a work of Basilides himself. So also Hort, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. 271. The same view is taken by Matthew Arnold, *God and the Bible*, p. 268, quoted by Dr Ezra Abbot (*Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, p. 86). But since there is room for doubt, I use an argument which does not assume the Basilidian authorship.

Johns. This Gospel speaks of him simply as John, so that a reader not otherwise informed would never have it suggested to him that there was another of the name. This fact is worth attention in connexion with what I shall have hereafter to say on the omissions of the Gospel, and on the question whether John is to be supposed ignorant of everything he does not record in his Gospel. I shall contend, on the contrary, that the things which John omits are things so very well known that he could safely assume his readers to be acquainted with them. It certainly is so in this instance; for no one disputes that, if the writer were not the Apostle John, he was someone who wished to pass for him. But a forger would be likely to have made some more distinct mention of the person who played the principal part in his scheme; and he certainly could scarcely have hit on such a note of genuineness as that, whereas almost everyone in the Church had felt the necessity of distinguishing by some special name John the forerunner from John the Apostle, there was one person who would feel no such necessity, and who would not form this habit—namely, the Apostle himself.

VI.

Part III.

THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

JUSTIN MARTYR—TATIAN.

It may now be regarded as proved, that towards the end of the second century our four Gospels were universally accepted in the Catholic Church as the peculiarly trustworthy records of the Saviour's life, and that they were then ascribed to the same authors as those to whom we now ascribe them. Why, then, are we not to accept this testimony? Is it because of any opposing evidence, external or internal? Postponing for a moment the question of internal evidence, opposing external evidence there is none. All that can be said is, The

evidence you have produced bears date a hundred years later than the books; we desire to have earlier testimony. Now, to take the case of a classical author, the testimony to whom bears some faint comparison with that to the Gospels; the plays of Terence are quoted by Cicero and Horace, and we require neither more nor earlier witnesses. No one objects: Cicero and Horace wrote a hundred years after Terence; what earlier witnesses can you produce to account for the intervening time? In the case of the Gospels, however, we can meet what I account an unreasonable demand. I began with the end of the second century, because then first the Christian literature of the period is so abundant as to leave no room for controversy as to the Gospels accepted by that age. We can, however, go back a couple of generations and remain on ground which cannot reasonably be contested.

The Apology of Justin Martyr was written about A.D. 150. That is the date Justin himself gives (*Apol.*, i. 46); and though, no doubt, it is only a round number, it is as near the truth as we can go. The Apology is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, who reigned from 138-161, and it twice (cc. 29, 31) speaks of events in the preceding reign (Hadrian's) as having happened 'just now.' Hence, some place the Apology in the very beginning of the reign of Antoninus. Eusebius dates it 141. Dr. Hort, in one of his earliest writings,* tried to prove that Justin died in 148. He did not convince me that there is evidence to justify any positive assertion about the matter; but in placing the Apology in 150, about the middle of the reign of Antoninus, we are sure that we cannot be very far wrong either way.

There has been a good deal of dispute about Justin's New Testament citations; but, as far as the judgment of candid men is concerned, the question may now be regarded as settled. The result of very long discussions and of a good

---

* *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, iii. 155. 1856. On the other hand, if we can rely on the genuineness of the Acts of Justin's martyrdom, he was condemned by Rusticus; and Borghesi, *Ouvrages*, viii. 545, has made out a probable case that Rusticus was *praefectus urbi* between 163 and 167.

deal of fighting has been to leave us where we had been. Any ordinary reader would have no doubt that Justin's works contain copious quotations from our Gospels; and the objections to accepting this conclusion made by those who professed to have gone closely into the matter have been dissipated by still closer examination. In his references to the events of our Lord's life, Justin goes over all the ground covered by our Evangelists, and almost completely abstains from going beyond it. He informs us also that he drew from written sources the accounts which he gives of our Lord's life. It is true, and our adversaries make the most of it, that he does not mention the names of the authors of these records. But the reason is, that he is addressing heathen who would not be interested in knowing the names of the Christian writers quoted; and he purposely avoids using Christian technical language. Thus, when he describes the Christian meetings for worship on the Lord's day, he says that they take place on the day which is called the 'day of the sun'; and again, he calls the Jews 'barbarians.' And so now he tells his heathen readers that he is quoting from 'memoirs' of our Lord which are called 'Gospels,' and which were composed by the Apostles and by those who followed them. Observe how accurately this agrees with our present Gospels—two being composed by Apostles, two by their immediate followers.

Justin adds that these memoirs were read along with the writings of the prophets at the meetings of Christians on each Sunday. Now, is it credible that the Gospels which Justin attests to have been placed by the Christian Church in equal rank with the prophets of the Old Testament, and to have been weekly read in their public assemblies, could be different from those Gospels which were confessedly a few years afterwards exclusively recognized through the Christian world? Here comes in with great force the reflex action, to which I have already referred, of the testimony of Irenæus. In his time our four Gospels were in such long-established honour, that it is certain they must have had the same rank at least one generation earlier. In Justin's time, *some* Gospels were in such honour as to be placed on a level in Church use with

the Old Testament Scriptures. We never hear of any revolution dethroning one set of Gospels and replacing them by another; and we may therefore conclude with tolerable certainty that the Gospels honoured by the Church in Justin's day were the same as those to which the same respect was paid in the days of Irenæus, some twenty or thirty years later.

The only plausible ground on which this has been contested is that Justin's citations frequently do not verbally correspond with our Gospels. Many of the differences that have been pointed out are trivial enough, as an example will enable you to judge. In order to show how pure was the morality taught by our Lord, Justin devotes three consecutive chapters to quoting his precepts. No other idea than that Justin was quoting our Gospels would occur to anyone whose acuteness had not been sharpened by the exigencies of controversy. For instance, 'He said, "Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away; for if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive what new thing do ye? Even the publicans do this. Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where robbers break through; but lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for it? Lay up treasure, therefore, in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt." And, "Be ye kind and merciful, as your Father also is kind and merciful, and maketh His sun to rise on sinners, and the righteous and the wicked. Take no thought what ye shall eat or what ye shall put on; are ye not better than the birds and the beasts? and God feedeth them. Take no thought, therefore, what ye shall eat or what ye shall put on; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added to you. For where his treasure is, there also is the mind of a man." And, "Do not these things to be seen of men, otherwise ye have no reward from your Father which is in heaven."' I need not pursue the quotation. I have read enough to enable you to understand the general character of

Justin's quotations. You will at once have recognized the words I read. If I ask you whence are they taken, you may perhaps reply, From the Sermon on the Mount. But if I go on to ask: Do you mean from the discourse recorded by St. Matthew, or from a parallel passage in St. Luke? you examine more minutely, and perhaps you find that Justin's version does not verbally agree with one or other. Then comes the question: How do you know that Justin is quoting either? May he not be taking his account from some other Gospel now lost, which contained a record of the same discourses? As far as the evidences of our religion are concerned, it makes no difference whether or not the hypothesis of a lost Gospel be true. It is no part of our faith to hold the doctrine of Irenæus, that it was in the nature of things impossible there should be more than four Gospels. We want to know what was the story concerning Jesus of Nazareth, in attestation of which the first preachers of Christianity were content to suffer hardships, and if need be to give their lives; and to give us that information the Gospel used by Justin, whatever it was, answers our purpose as well as any Gospel we have. It might be uncomfortable to our feelings to believe that Christian writers for the first century and a half used a different Gospel from ours, and that the Church, A.D. 170, for some unaccountable reason, thought proper to bury its ancient text-book in oblivion, and set up our four Gospels in its room. But what would scepticism have gained, when it is also proved that this lost Gospel must have been as like to our present Gospels as the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark are to each other?* Substantially the same facts are related in all, and told in the same way.

I will just take the account of our Lord's infancy, the subject above all others on which the apocryphal Gospels afterwards ran wild, and you will see that Justin follows throughout the narrative of our existing Evangelists. He does not appear to have known anything more than they knew, and he tells, without doubt, what they have related. I give a summary in

* This idea has been worked out by Mr. Sadler in his book called 'The Lost Gospel.'

Westcott's words (*New Testament Canon*, p. 101):—'He tells us that Christ was descended from Abraham through Jacob, Judah, Phares, Jesse, and David — that the angel Gabriel was sent to announce His birth to the Virgin Mary —that this was a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah (vii. 14) —that Joseph was forbidden in a vision to put away his espoused wife when he was so minded—that our Saviour's birth at Bethlehem had been foretold by Micah—that His parents went thither from Nazareth, where they dwelt, in consequence of the enrolment of Cyrenius—that as they could not find a lodging in the village, they lodged in a cave close by it, where Christ was born, and laid by Mary in a manger —that while there, wise men from Arabia, guided by a star, worshipped Him, and offered Him gold, and frankincense, and myrrh, and by revelation were commanded not to return to Herod, to whom they had first come—that He was called Jesus, as the Saviour of His people—that by the command of God His parents fled with Him to Egypt for fear of Herod, and remained there till Archelaus succeeded him—that Herod, being deceived by the wise men, commanded the children of Bethlehem to be put to death, so that the prophecy of Jeremiah was fulfilled, who spoke of Rachel weeping for her children—that Jesus grew after the common manner of men, working as a carpenter, and so waited thirty years, more or less, till the coming of John the Baptist.' I need not continue Justin's account of our Saviour's life. This specimen of his account of that part of it where, if anywhere, a difference from the canonical Gospels would be likely to be found, is enough to show that the Gospel used by Justin told substantially the same story as that related in the Gospels we have, and that, as far as controversy with unbelievers is concerned, it is quite immaterial which Gospel is appealed to.

There remains the purely literary question, Is there reason to believe in the existence of this alleged lost Gospel? 'Entia non sunt multiplicanda præter necessitatem,' and the question is, Are we put under a necessity of postulating the existence of a Gospel which has disappeared, by reason of verbal differences forbidding us to find in our present Gospels the source of Justin's quotations? An answer to this question has been

provided by a study of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament, which enables us to know what degree of accuracy is to be expected from him. In that case we know what he means to quote, and we find him quoting loosely and inaccurately, and quoting the same passage differently different times.* When we think it strange that an ancient father of Justin's date should not quote with perfect accuracy, we forget that in those days, when manuscripts were scarce, and when concordances did not exist, the process of finding a passage in a manuscript (written possibly with no spaces between the words), and copying it, was not performed with quite as much ease as an English clergyman, writing his sermon with his Bible at his side, can turn up any text he wishes to refer to; and yet I should be sorry to vouch for the verbal accuracy of all the Scripture citations we hear in sermons at the present day. The excuse for such inaccuracy at present is one which Justin, too, may have pleaded—that exactly in proportion to a man's familiarity with a book is his disposition to trust his memory, and not verify a reference to it. And the applicability of this remark is confirmed by the fact that there is very much less accuracy in Justin's short quotations, which would be made from memory, than in his long ones, where it would be worth while or necessary for him to turn to the book.

On the whole, then, the general coincidence, in range and contents, of Justin's quotations with our Gospels is enough to show that they are the sources whence Justin drew his

* See a table of Justin's Old Testament quotations given by Westcott (*New Testament Canon*, p. 172). Dr. Sanday, in his *Gospels in the Second Century*, has shown that no greater exactness of quotation is found when we study the quotations of the Old Testament in the New, or in the Apostolic Fathers, or the quotations of the New Testament by Irenæus. I find in an unpublished Paper by the late Bishop Fitz Gerald an apposite quotation from the preface to Pearce's 'Longinus':—Neque enim aut Longino aut aliis priorum saeculorum scriptoribus videtur usitatum fuisse accurate fideque satis verba citare. Imo nusquam si bene memini, Longinus per totum suum Commentarium cujusvis auctoris locum iisdem verbis (modo pluribus quam duobus aut tribus consisteret) exhibuit; nec aliter ab aliis scriptoribus factum video. Si enim sensum auctoris et praecipua citatae sententiae verba ob oculos lectoris ponerent, de caeteris minus soliciti fuere. Accurata haec citandi diligentia, qua hodie utimur, quaeque laudabilis sane est, frustra in veteribus quaerenda est.—*Praef. in Longinum*, p. xix., ed. 1732.

information. I will give for each of the Gospels one specimen of a multitude of proofs. In relating the murder of the innocents at Bethlehem, he quotes Jeremiah's prophecy of Rachel weeping for her children, and that in a form agreeing with St. Matthew and differing from the Septuagint. Hence, even if we had no other proof, we could infer that he used St. Matthew's Gospel. Mark has so little that is not in St. Matthew or St. Luke that it might be thought difficult to identify anonymous citations with his Gospel. Yet Justin's quotations from the Gospels are so numerous, that besides some very probable references to Mark, they touch on one point certainly peculiar to him, namely, that Jesus gave to the sons of Zebedee the name of Boanerges. St. Mark alone has preserved to us this and some other Aramaic words used by our Saviour, as Corban, Ephphatha, Abba, Talitha Cumi. St. Luke is, no doubt, Justin's authority for stating that the visit of Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem was occasioned by the taxing under Cyrenius. And I may add that Justin even helps us in the case of disputed readings in St. Luke, for he has a reference to our Lord's bloody sweat, which gives an important attestation to the verses, Luke xxii. 43, 44, which are wanting in the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS., but found in the Sinaitic as well as in almost all other MSS. As I have mentioned the subject of various readings, I may add that if it could be proved that Justin never trusted his memory, but always literally copied the Gospel he was using—a thing that cannot be proved, for he sometimes quotes the same passage differently—it still would not follow that he was using a different Gospel from ours. It might only be that his copy of Matthew or Luke had readings different from our received text. I will not anticipate what belongs to another branch of our subject by entering into the proofs of the early existence of various readings. Suffice it to say that this is a point which has to be attended to by any careful critic of Justin's quotations. That Justin used the three Synoptic Gospels may be regarded as now accepted by the common consent of candid critics: being as freely acknowledged by Hilgenfeld* in Ger-

* Professor of Theology at Jena, one of the ablest living representatives of the school of criticism founded by Baur.

many as by Lightfoot or Westcott in England. Justin's variations, then, from our text of these Gospels may be divided into three classes. The greater number are quite sufficiently accounted for by the ordinary looseness of *memoriter* citations; a few demand the attention of the textual critic as suggesting the possible existence of a various reading in Justin's manuscript; and lastly, a few more suggest the possibility that, in addition to our Gospels, Justin may have used an extra-Canonical Gospel. For example, in the abstract I read of Justin's account of our Lord's childhood, you may perhaps have noticed that he says that the Magi came from Arabia. Now, St. Matthew only says that they came from the East; and the question arises, Did Justin draw this localization from a written source, or was he merely expressing the view in his time popularly held as to what St. Matthew meant by the East? A similar question arises as to the statement that Joseph and Mary, when they could find no room in the inn, lodged in a cave. It seems to me very possible that Justin was here drawing from no written source, but that, being a native of Palestine, he described what the received tradition of his time accepted as the scene of our Lord's birth. Justin's additions to our evangelic narrative are exceedingly few and unimportant; but there is no reason why we should not admit, as a possible account of them, that our Gospels were not the only written documents with which Justin was acquainted. But I do not think it possible that any such document could be raised to the level of our four Gospels, even if it had the benefit of far more distinct recognition by Justin than it can actually claim.

I have said that Justin's use of the Synoptic Gospels is now pretty generally admitted; but there is still a good deal of unwillingness to acknowledge his use of St. John's. That Gospel deals less in history than do the first three Gospels; and so there are fewer incidents mentioned by Justin which we can clearly prove to be taken from St. John, while the discourses of that Gospel present little that is suitable for quotation in discussion with unbelievers. Yet there are coincidences enough to establish satisfactorily Justin's acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, there being scarcely a chapter of it

of which some trace may not be found in his works.* But what weighs with me far more is, that the whole doctrinal system of Justin, and in particular his conception of our Lord as the eternal Logos, presupposes St. John to such an extent, that anyone who does not acknowledge it is, in my judgment, either a poor critic or an uncandid controversialist. The name 'Logos' is habitually used by Justin, occurring more than twenty times. His doctrine is, that this Logos existed before all creation, dwelling with the Father;† that He was God;‡ that by Him all things were made;§ that this pre-existent Word took form and became man, and was called Jesus Christ (*Apol.* i. 5, 63; *Dial.* 48); and that He was the only-begotten ‖ of the Father.

* See an Article by Thoma in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie* for 1875. Thoma does not discuss Justin's knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, regarding this as having passed out of the reign of controversy; but he takes St. John, chapter by chapter, exhibiting for each the trace it has left in Justin's works: the result being to show that Justin is completely saturated with that Gospel. Thoma is less successful in establishing a special theory of his own, namely, that Justin, though acquainted with the fourth Gospel, did not regard it as of equal authority with the others, or number it among the 'Memoirs of the Apostles,' which were read in the Christian public worship. For this he has no proof but the very precarious argument *ex silentio*, that Justin does not make as much use of the fourth Gospel as Thoma thinks he would have made if he owned its authority. Dr. Ezra Abbot, a Unitarian, Professor in Harvard University, has dealt well with this argument in his *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 63. He shows that Justin, writing to unbelievers, cannot be expected to make the use of New Testament writings he would have made if addressing men who owned their authority; that he actually uses them more than do other apologists; that he does not offer proofs from the Apocalypse, though he confessedly accepted it as an inspired prophecy; and Dr. Abbot adds some instances from modern writers of surprising neglect to use an argument or recognize a fact which we should have confidently expected them to use or recognize. Dr. Abbot, who was one of the most learned of American Theologians, died in 1885.

† ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱός, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε.—*Apol.* ii. 6.

ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Θεὸς γεγέννηκε δύναμιν τινὰ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἥτις καὶ δόξα κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ υἱὸς, ποτὲ δὲ σοφία, ποτὲ δὲ ἄγγελος, ποτὲ δὲ θεὸς, ποτὲ δὲ κύριος καὶ λόγος.—*Dial.* 61.

πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ πατρί.—*Dial.* 62.

‡ αὐτὸς ὢν οὗτος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθείς.—*Dial.* 61: see also *Apol.* i. 63; *Dial.* 56, 58, 126, 128.

§ ὥστε λόγῳ θεοῦ . . . γεγενῆσθαι τὸν πάντα κόσμον.—*Apol.* i. 52; see also c. 64, and *Apol.* ii. 6.

‖ μονογενὴς ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων.—*Dial.* 105.

I have by no means enumerated all the coincidences between the teaching of Justin and the prologue of St. John; but that there is very striking agreement you cannot have failed to see. We ask, is there any reason for rejecting the simple account of this agreement, that Justin was a disciple of St. John: not indeed by personal companionship, but by study of his Gospel, which we have good independent reason to think must have been current at the time, and which Justin could hardly have helped knowing? And it deserves to be borne in mind that Justin seems to have learned his Christianity at Ephesus (Euseb., *H. E.* IV. 18), which is generally allowed to have been the birthplace of the fourth Gospel. When we have to speak of the agreement between Justin and the Synoptic Evangelists as to the incidents of our Saviour's life on earth, it is now felt to be a gratuitous and unreasonable assumption to imagine that Justin drew his account not from our Synoptics, but from a lost Gospel coincident with them in a multitude of particulars. Have we any stronger justification for imagining a lost spiritual Gospel identical with St. John's in respect of its teaching as to the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord? Not that these doctrines are peculiar to St. John: they are taught as distinctly by St. Paul (see in particular Col. i.); but what may be regarded as special to St. John is the use of the word Logos, to denote the pre-existent Saviour. This name is not found in any of the New Testament writings but the Johannine,* nor does John represent our Lord as ever calling himself by it. If we ask from what other source but St. John the name could have been derived by Justin, we are referred to the writings of the Alexandrian Jew Philo, who speaks frequently of the Divine Word, though there has been much controversy whether he means to ascribe to Him a distinct personality, or merely uses personifying language about the Divine attribute of Wisdom. Nothing forbids us to believe that the speculations of Philo may have been known to St. John.† We have in fact a connecting-link in the Alexandrian

* It is not certain whether Heb. iv. 12 is an exception to what is here stated.

† Philo was teaching in Alexandria in our Lord's lifetime, so there is no chronological difficulty.

Jew Apollos, who taught in Ephesus. It would be quite in the spirit in which Paul dealt with the Grecian philosophers at Athens if John, when not professing to record the words of Jesus, but speaking in his own person, presented Christianity to those whose training had been Alexandrian, by acknowledging and accepting all that was true in the Philonic speculations about the Divine Logos, but went on to tell of what Philo had not dreamed, that 'the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us.' Now what we find in Justin is not the Philonic but the Johannine doctrine of the Logos, the doctrine of the Logos incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ. If before Justin's time anyone but the fourth Evangelist had presented in this form his doctrine concerning our Lord, how is it that all memory of it has perished ?*

Let me next say something of Justin's mode of presenting another Christian doctrine, that of Baptism. Justin's name for the rite is 'regeneration.' Speaking of new converts, he says (*Apol.* i. 61): 'They are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner that we ourselves were regenerated. For they then receive the washing of water in the name of God the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ also said, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." Now that it is impossible for those who have been once born to enter into

* The relations between the Logos doctrine of Justin and that of Philo and of St. John have been carefully investigated by a very able and learned Unitarian, Dr. James Drummond, Principal of Manchester New College, London, in a Paper published by him in the *Theological Review*, April, 1877. In connexion with this may be read a Lecture on Philo, published by him in the same year, and since enlarged into a treatise in two volumes, 1888. Dr. Drummond conclusively establishes the dependence of Justin's doctrine on St. John's, of which internal evidence shows it to be a later development. 'Not only is every point in the Johannine doctrine contained in Justin's, but almost every portion of it is presented with amplifications; its ambiguous statements are resolved into the requisite number of definite propositions, and questions which it suggests, and does not answer, are dogmatically settled.' The same Paper contains an excellent enumeration of verbal coincidences between Justin and the fourth Gospel. Of these, one which Dr. Drummond has himself added to the list of those previously observed has special interest for me, on account of its turning on an interpretation of John xix. 13, which many years ago I had been in the habit of hearing maintained by Archbishop Whately. He held that, in the phrase ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ βήματος, the verb

their mothers' wombs is manifest to all.' I am sure it is equally manifest to all that there is here striking coincidence with the discourse with Nicodemus recorded by St. John.

Now let me add a word as to the cumulative effect of Justin's doctrinal agreements with St. John, and his verbal agreements of which this is a specimen. His doctrine is in perfect harmony with St. John, and we are puzzled to say from what other source he could have derived it. There are also a number of verbal echoes of St. John, not indeed exact, but very closely reproducing him. If Justin used St. John, everything is explained: you may try to find some hypothesis which will account for one sort of agreements, and some hypothesis which will account for the other; but how violent the improbability that both hypotheses shall be true. In the present case, when we ask where Justin found these words of Christ, 'Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,' we are inclined to laugh at the special pleading which answers us, Surely not in St. John. Justin says, 'except *ye* be born again'; St. John, 'except *a man* be born again.' Justin says, 'the kingdom of heaven'; St. John, 'the kingdom of God.'* And we are referred, as the more probable original of Justin's quotation, to St. Matthew (xviii. 3), 'Except ye become as little children ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' But what, then, about the following sentence as to the impossibility of again entering

---

ἐκάθισεν was to be understood transitively, as in 1 Cor. vi. 4; Eph. i. 20. Then the translation would run: 'Pilate brought Jesus forth, seated him on the judgment-seat, . . . and saith unto the Jews, Behold your King.' That is to say, Pilate in presenting Jesus to the Jews as their King, seats Him, with mock reverence, in his own judgment-seat. Now Dr. Drummond points out that Justin (*Apol.* i. 35), has διασύροντες αὐτὸν ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ εἶπον, Κρῖνον ἡμῖν. Except for the change of the singular into the plural, Justin's phrase is identical with St. John's. It seems a reasonable inference that Justin read the verse in St. John, and that he there understood the verb transitively.

* Dr. Ezra Abbot shows that Justin has the company of several subsequent Fathers in every one of his variations from St. John. He gives references to nine passages where Jeremy Taylor (who is not supposed to have used apocryphal Gospels) quotes the text; none of the quotations agreeing with St. John, and only two with each other. And he remarks that the English Book of Common Prayer, which twice quotes the text, in neither case agrees with St. John. The late Irish revisers have been so punctilious as to correct this irregularity.

our mother's womb? Is this but a chance thought which occurred to Justin and to St. John independently?

It may be well, however, not to omit to notice one of Strauss's supposed proofs, that Justin did not use the dialogue with Nicodemus, because the argument has recoiled on himself. A reference to this same passage in John is found also in the Clementine Homilies (*Hom.* xi. 26), of which I made mention in a previous Lecture. The quotation is, like Justin's, inexact; and though it does not verbally agree with Justin's either, it agrees with him in this point, that both use the second person plural,* 'except ye be born again,' while St. John says, 'except a man be born again.' Hence it was argued that Justin and the Clementines both drew the idea, not from St. John, but from some other common source. Now, the Clementines contained other apparent proofs of acquaintance with St. John's Gospel, as, for instance, that they attribute to Jesus the sayings, 'I am the door,' and 'My sheep hear My voice.' (*Hom.* iii. 52). But the Tübingen writers expended their ingenuity to prove that this coincidence in language was only accidental, and their cardinal argument was that the author of the Clementines *could* not have used the fourth Gospel. He was, as I have already said, an Ebionite; John, on the contrary, the most anti-Jewish of New Testament writers. The Clementine writer, therefore, *could* not have accepted a book so opposed to his tendency; and, if he had known it, would have cited it only to combat it.

While this dispute was going on, a manuscript was discovered, containing a complete† copy of the twenty Clementine Homilies—for the manuscript previously known was defective, breaking off in the middle of the nineteenth—and lo, in the newly-recovered part of the nineteenth, we read, 'Our Lord answered to those who asked Him, "Is it he who hath sinned, or his parents, that he was born blind?"—"Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents; but that through him might be manifested the power of God, which heals sins of ignorance."' There are verbal differences of quotation here, but only a few of our adversaries have, as yet,

* Not so, however, in the parallel passage (*Recog.* vi. 9).
† The work was first published complete by Dressel, in 1853.

mustered courage to make them a ground for denying that it is a quotation.*

Now, it being thus proved that the Clementine writer acknowledged the fourth Gospel, the argument which had been used by the deniers of this fact recoils on them with immense force—namely, the argument founded on the diametrical opposition between the views of the Clementine author and of the Evangelist. Ebionites would not easily accept a work proceeding from quite an opposite school, if it were one of modern origin, or if there were any reasonable pretext for denying its apostolic authority. The conclusion follows that, at the time of the composition of the Clementines, which some place as early as the year 160,† the authority of St. John's Gospel was so universally recognized in the Church by men of all parties, and dated so far back, that no suspicion occurred to men strongly interested in rejecting the book if they could have ventured to do so. Thus the Clementines, to which Strauss referred us, prove that, in the time when Justin lived, he could hardly help being acquainted with the fourth Gospel; so that there is no reason whatever for not drawing the obvious inferences from those passages in his writings which are on the face of them quotations from it.

I have not time to speak of Justin's Eucharistic doctrine, nor of a number of verbal coincidences with John; but must repeat that the critics who deny Justin's use of the fourth

* Among those who had this courage was the author of 'Supernatural Religion'; but Hilgenfeld (who, in a review of this work (*Zeitschrift*, 1875, 582), pronounces that this author exhibits as much partiality *against* as do the orthodox *for* the received acceptation of the Gospels), declares here that it will be difficult to find anyone in Germany or Switzerland to believe that the Clementine writer is independent of St. John—'In Deutschland und der Schweiz wird es kaum jemand glauben dass Clem. Hom. xix. 22 von Joh. ix. 1–3 unabhänging sein sollte.' Renan, whose memory seems to have failed him a good deal in the composition of his later volumes, states (vi. 73) that the author of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies did not know the fourth Gospel, and in the same volume (p. 500) that he knew all four. The explanation probably is, that Renan in the two places was relying on different authorities, one of whom wrote before, the other after, the discovery of the conclusion of the nineteenth Homily.

† I am myself willing to accept so early a date only for the discourses of Peter against the heathen, which were the basis of the work, and which seem to me to have been used in 180 by Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.* i. 10; *cf.* Clem. *Hom.* x. 16; *Recog.* v. 20).

Gospel seem to have no conception of the cumulative force of evidence. After giving a forced explanation of one of these coincidences, they go on to explain away another, and another after that, without ever reflecting that it is necessary for the success of their argument that every one of these explanations should be correct; and that if there are chances against the correctness of each one of them, the chances against the correctness of the entire series must be enormous. I will only add that Justin used not only St. John's Gospel, but also his First Epistle. This is shown by a coincidence which seems to me to afford decisive proof. In 1 John, iii. 1, the four oldest manuscripts, well confirmed by other evidence, add to the received text the words καὶ ἐσμέν—'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the sons of God; *and such we are*.' This reading is accordingly adopted by all recent critical editors. Now, Justin has (*Dial.* 123) καὶ θεοῦ τέκνα ἀληθινὰ καλούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν.*

* One of the latest essays on Justin's use of St. John is by Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, Master of the City of London School (*Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 559, 716). Dr. Abbott adopts Thoma's theory, only in a less probable form. He does not deny that Justin may have been acquainted with St. John's Gospel, but he denies that he valued it, or, indeed, that he ever used it. A number of coincidences are explained away one after another. In some cases Justin is drawing directly from Philo, in others from Christian disciples of Philo, or he is using traditions which were also known to the fourth Evangelist. The saying about entering into the mother's womb referred, no doubt, to a stock objection made by heathens to Christian missionaries, who spoke to them of the necessity of a new birth and of becoming like little children. It seems to me that, however difficult it might have been to resist the cumulative force of so many coincidences, Dr. Abbott would have done better for his theory if he had avoided making the fatal concession that Justin might have known the fourth Gospel. For then we have a *vera causa* which at once accounts for his coincidences with it, and it becomes unscientific in the last degree to invent imaginary disciples of Philo or unrecorded traditions in order to explain what can be perfectly well explained without any such hypothesis. If any author of the present day presented as many coincidences with a previous writer, he would be laughed to scorn by his reviewers if, while he had to own that he had seen the previous book, he denied that he valued it or had used it.

Thoma's question, If Justin valued the fourth Gospel, why did he not use it more? has been so well answered by Dr. Drummond and by Dr. Ezra Abbot, that a man must be argument-proof who repeats the question after reading what they have said. It seems to me clear that, if Justin knew the fourth Gospel, he used it, and that copiously; if he used it, he valued it, for his whole theological system is founded on it. If he

Renan's vacillations on the subject of St. John's Gospel are extraordinary. In the preface to his first volume (p. xxv.) he gives a summary, endorsing the conclusions which I have presented for your acceptance: — 'Nobody doubts that, towards the year 150, the fourth Gospel existed, and was ascribed to John. Formal citations by St. Justin (*Apol.* i. 32, 61; *Dial.* 88); by Athenagoras (*Legat.* 40); by Tatian (*Adv. Graec.* 5, 7; *cf.* Euseb. *H. E.*, iv. 29; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 20); by Theophilus of Antioch (*ad. Autol.* ii. 22); by Irenæus (II. xxii. 5; iii. 1; *cf.* Euseb. *H. E.*, v. 8), show this Gospel, from that time forward, mingling in all controversies, and serving as a corner-stone in the development of dogma. Irenæus is express: now Irenæus came out of the school of John, and between him and the Apostle there was only Polycarp. The part played by our Gospel in Gnosticism, and in particular in the system of Valentinus (Iren. I. iii. 6; III. xi. 7; Hippol. *Philosoph.* VI. ii. 29, &c.), in Montanism (Iren. III. xi. 9), and in the Quarto-deciman dispute (Euseb. *H. E.*, v. 24), is not less decisive. The school of John is that whose influence

adopted the fourth Evangelist as his theological instructor, he must have admitted the claims which that Evangelist implicitly makes for himself, and which were acknowledged all over the Christian world within thirty years of Justin's time.

Dr. Abbott's views are most eccentric when he treats of the Gnostic use of St. John's Gospel. He admits that it was a favourite with the Valentinians, but he thinks that to be a reason why it could not have been a favourite with Justin, who opposed these heretics. He owns that it was used by Tatian, but he thinks that must have been after Justin's death, and when Tatian had become a Gnostic. He does not seem to have studied the links by which Tatian's apologetic work is doubly connected with Justin and with the fourth Gospel. Finally, when called on to explain how this Gospel, in such favour with the Gnostics, but rejected by their orthodox opponent, came into equal favour with the Catholics also, and that so rapidly, that all traces of hesitation have been obliterated except what may be discovered in Justin; Dr. Abbott replies that the success was due 'to the intrinsic power of this most spiritual treatise,' 'because it truthfully protested against the thaumaturgic tendencies of the Church, by exhibiting Jesus principally as a worker of spiritual, and not material, marvels.' This seems undeserved praise to give to the narrator of the healing of the man born blind, and of the raising of Lazarus; nor does it seem a satisfactory explanation to say that a heretical book won the favour of the Church by reason of its protest against the tendencies of the Church. In my judgment, a critic who cannot divest himself of the anti-supernaturalist feelings of the nineteenth century is not one who can enter into the mind of the second century, and is no competent judge what arguments a writer of that date would have been likely to use.

can be most distinctly traced in the second century; but that school cannot be explained unless we place the fourth Gospel at its very cradle. Let us add, that the first Epistle ascribed to John is certainly by the same author as the fourth Gospel.* Now, that Epistle is recognized as John's by Polycarp (*ad Philipp.* 7), by Papias (Euseb., *H. E.* iii. 39, 40), and by Irenæus (III. xvi. 5, 8; Euseb., *H. E.* v. 8).'

During the interval, however, between the publication of his first volume and his sixth, Renan appears to have received a revelation (for he makes no pretence of offering a proof) that the fourth Gospel was unknown to several of those whom he had already cited as authorities.† He assures his readers, as a positive fact (VI. 73), that neither Papias nor Justin, nor the Pseudo-Clementines, nor Marcion, were acquainted with the fourth Gospel; and he suggests that the Evangelist must have taken some pains not to let his Gospel be seen by those who would know that it did not come from John. Renan owns (p. 69) that Justin has a theory of the Logos analogous to that of 'the Pseudo-John,' and he refers to *Apol.* i. 23, 32; ii. 6, 10, 13; *Dial.* 61, 62, 70, 98, 100, 102, 105, 127; but we are on no account to believe that Justin derived this theory from the fourth Gospel. He tells us (p. 503) that Tatian did not know, or did not admit, the fourth Gospel; that it is wrong to think that Tatian's 'Diatessaron' commenced with 'In the beginning was the Word'; wrong to think that this title implied the four Canonical Gospels. It is a term borrowed from Greek music, and only implies perfect harmony. The Synoptics, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and the Gospel of Peter, were the basis of this harmony. I shall speak presently of Tatian, and you will then know why Renan was obliged entirely to alter in his seventh volume the account he had given of the 'Diatessaron' in his sixth. But Renan's perplexity rises to its height when (p. 129) he speaks of Papias, of whom I shall treat in the next Lecture, and when he tries to account for the 'singular fact' that 'Papias, who

* 1 John, i. 3, 5. 'The two writings offer the most complete identity of style, the same terms, the same favourite expressions' (Renan's note).

† Accordingly, I find that the passage cited above has been modified in later editions.

does not know the fourth Gospel, should know the Epistle falsely ascribed to John.' After some lame attempts at explanation, he exclaims, 'One can never touch the question of the writings ascribed to John without falling into contradictions and anomalies.' But there would have been neither contradiction nor anomaly if Renan had remained content with the statement of evidence given in his first volume.

To return to Justin: we are happily able to bridge over the interval between him and Irenæus by means of Justin's pupil, Tatian the Assyrian. It is related that Tatian was converted by Justin; and in Tatian's apologetic work, the 'Address to the Greeks,' Justin is spoken of with high admiration.* On the other hand, after Justin's death, Tatian joined himself to one of those ascetic sects which condemned both marriage and the use of wine and flesh meat as absolutely unlawful to a Christian.† And he is said to have held some other heretical opinions besides. Irenæus has a chapter on the heresy of Tatian, and he speaks of him in the past tense in a way which conveys the idea that he was dead, and his teaching over, at the time Irenæus wrote. Clement of Alexandria tells us that one of his own teachers was an Assyrian, and it has been very commonly thought that this was Tatian. Thus we see that Tatian comes midway between Justin Martyr and the age of Irenæus and Clement. Now, when we take up Tatian's apologetic work already mentioned, we find at the outset a statement of Logos doctrine near akin to Justin's; while Tatian's use of St. John is evinced by some distinct quotations—'All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made,' 'This is the saying, "The darkness comprehendeth not the light,"' and 'God is a Spirit.' Thus Tatian gives distinct confirmation to the conclusion we already arrived at as to the derivation of

* Zahn gives some probable reasons for dating this work not later than 161 (*Forschungen* i., 279.)

† It is necessary to bear in mind this special feature of Tatian's heresy in order to appreciate the merits of Dr. Abbott's suggestion that, after Tatian had come to think it a sin to marry or to drink wine, the 2nd chapter of St. John's Gospel began to have an attraction for him which it did not possess in the days of his orthodoxy. Plainly, no Encratite would receive the fourth Gospel unless, before embracing his heresy, he had been so long in the habit of using that Gospel that he could not then give it up.

Justin's Logos doctrine from St. John. But Tatian also enables us to settle the question raised by Thoma, If Justin knew St. John, did he put it on an equality with the Synoptic Gospels?

I have already said that the earliest commentary on a New Testament book of which we have knowledge is by a heretic, Heracleon; and I have now to add that it was also a heretic, Tatian, who appears to have been the first to make a harmony of the Gospels. Eusebius tells us that Tatian made a combination of the Gospels, and that he called it 'Diatessaron,'* which, being a recognized musical term, answers in some sort to what we call a harmony. Sceptical critics have made enormous efforts to escape the inferences suggested by the use of the name 'Diatessaron'—viz., that the harmony was based on four Gospels, and that these were the four which we know were, in the next generation, regarded as holding a place of divinely ordained pre-eminence. It is unnecessary for me to state the reasons which first led me to pronounce these efforts to have utterly failed, because recent discoveries have since given them a decisive refutation.

Tatian's arrangement of the Gospel history obtained very large circulation, which amounts to saying that it found acceptance with the orthodox; for the followers of Tatian in his heretical opinions were very few. The use of the 'Diatessaron' at Edessa is mentioned in an apocryphal Syriac book,

---

* The following note on the musical term διὰ τεσσάρων has been given me by my friend Professor Mahaffy:—

'Among the old Greeks only the octave (διὰ πασῶν), the fifth (διὰ πέντε), and the fourth (διὰ τεσσάρων), were recognized as concords (σύμφωνοι φθογγοί), whereas the rest of the intervals are called discords (διάφωνοι). This definition of concord, excluding thirds, which are now accepted as the simplest and easiest case, arises from Pythagoras' discovery, that if, of two equal strings, one be stopped at points dividing the string in the ratios of 1 : 2; 2 : 3; and 3 : 4, the octave, fifth, and fourth above the sister string are produced. Hence he regarded these intervals as perfect concords, and this opinion was general till the time of Des Cartes, who first boldly asserted that thirds were concords. It may be added that, even now, most of the major thirds we hear are less than two whole tones apart. This interval, when strictly produced, sounds like a sharp third, and is disagreeable. The difficulty is avoided by the temperament in our tuning.'

From this explanation it is seen to be improper to treat the phrase 'Diatessaron' as one merely denoting harmony, and not implying any

probably written about the middle of the third century.* Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 20), writing in the middle of the fifth century, bears witness to the still extensive use of it, apparently in the public Church reading of his own diocese (Cyrus, near the Euphrates); and states that he found more than two hundred copies in use in the churches of his district, which he took away, and replaced by copies of the four Gospels. The work of substituting a single narrative for our four would naturally involve many omissions from the text of our Gospels, and it would seem to be this mutilation of the sacred text which brought Tatian's work into disrepute. At least Theodoret censures it for cutting out the genealogies and other passages which show that our Lord was born of the seed of David after the flesh; and he implies, though perhaps the imputation is undeserved, that Tatian had a heretical object in this mutilation. A harmony not open to this objection was made, in the third century, by Ammonius of Alexandria. He took St. Matthew's Gospel as the basis of his work, and put side by side with St. Matthew the parallel passages from other Gospels. We learn this from a letter of Eusebius (*Epist. ad Carpianum*) prefatory to his own improved way of harmonizing the Gospels—the Eusebian Canons—which will come under our consideration later.

To return to Tatian: the strongest proof of the orthodox use of his harmony is that the most famous of the native Syrian fathers, Ephraem of Edessa, who died in 373, wrote a

---

particular number of Gospels. We see also that, since the phrase denotes, not a harmony of four, but a concord between the first and fourth terms of a series, it was used improperly by Tatian, unless his work had been one on the relations between the Evangelists Matthew and John. But strict propriety of language is rare when terms of art are used metaphorically by outsiders.

My friend Dr. Quarry has given me the curious information that Diatessaron is not only a musical but a medical term. It denoted a plaister made of four ingredients; the Diapente was another common plaister made of five (*Caelius Aurelianus*, iv. 7, vol. ii. p. 331: ed. Haller, 1774). See also Galen, *De compositione medicament. per genera*, v. p. 157, Leipzig, 1827. Dr. Quarry thinks that a well-known blunder made by Victor of Capua, in writing Diapente where he ought to have written Diatessaron, is a confusion more likely to have arisen from the common use of the words as medical than as musical terms; the former use being popular at the time in question, the latter then confined to a few.

* Phillips, *Doctrine of Addai*, p. 34.

commentary on the 'Diatessaron,' apparently as if it were the version of the New Testament then in ecclesiastical use. This fact till lately rested on the testimony of a rather late Syrian writer, Dionysius Bar-Salibi, who wrote towards the end of the twelfth century, and who gives the further information that the harmony commenced, 'In the beginning was the Word,' which would place Tatian's use of St. John's Gospel beyond doubt. You can well imagine that sceptical critics made every effort to set aside testimony which would force on them so unwelcome a conclusion. Bishop Lightfoot, in an article in the *Contemporary Review* (May, 1877), convincingly showed that the attempts to break down the testimony of Bar-Salibi had been utterly unsuccessful. But since then the question has assumed a new aspect, by the substantial recovery of the very work of Ephraem Syrus which Bar-Salibi described. It comes to us, indeed, in a roundabout way. The common opinion has been that Tatian's harmony was originally written in Greek, and so the Greek name 'Diatessaron' would lead us to suppose. Zahn* has lately taken a good deal of pains to maintain that the original language was Syriac, and it is certain that the Diatessaron had considerable circulation in Syriac-speaking countries, and apparently very little where Greek was spoken.† However that may be, if it had been originally Greek, it had been translated into Syriac, and had come into use in Syriac-speaking churches before Ephraem commented on it. This commentary of Ephraem is extant in an Armenian translation, apparently of the fifth

---

* *Tatian's Diatessaron*, Erlangen, 1881. Zahn is Professor of Theology at Leipzig, and belongs to the Conservative school.

† Baethgen maintained the somewhat startling thesis that the 'Diatessaron' was the earliest form in which the Gospel history became known to Syriac-speaking people ('*Evangelienfragmente*,' Leipzig, 1885.) His view has been adopted by Zahn, who now holds that Tatian returning from the West to his native Edessa, gave the Syriac-speaking people their first history of our Lord's life in their own tongue, in the form of a single Gospel, framed by combining the Greek four. Zahn holds that the Diatessaron continued for more than a century to be the only Gospel known to Syriac-speaking people; and he accounts for the affinities that have been noticed between the Diatessaron and the Syriac version published by Dr. Cureton, by the supposition that those who first translated the entire Greek Gospels into Syriac were influenced by the phraseology of the Diatessaron with which they were familiar. If Zahn's speculations

century, and was actually published in that language by the Mechitarist Fathers, at Venice, so long ago as 1836. But in the obscurity of that language it remained unknown to Western scholars until a Latin translation of it was published by Moesinger, in 1876, and it took three or four years more before the publication attracted much attention.* That this work is Ephraem's I think there can be no reasonable doubt. It consists of a series of homiletic notes, and these (as we had been led to expect) not following the order of any one of our Gospels, but passing from one to another: in other words, the commentary is on a narrative framed by putting together passages from different Gospels. The commentary enables us to reconstruct, at least in its substance, the text which was commented on. I say 'in its substance,' because we cannot infer with certainty that a verse was absent from the harmony because it is not commented on by Ephraem, it being possible that he found nothing in the verse on which he thought it necessary to remark; nor, again, can we infer that a verse was present in the harmony because Ephraem, commenting on a different verse, refers to it, since Ephraem was no doubt familiar, not only with the harmony on which he commented, but with the full text of the four Gospels. But although, for the reasons I have indicated, we cannot pretend to be exact in every detail, we can recover the general outline of the text commented on.

We have important helps in the work of reconstruction. In the year 543 Victor of Capua found a Latin harmony of

as to the Latin translation be correct, Tatian would deserve the honour of being the first to make a vernacular translation of any part of the New Testament. But it seems to me very improbable that the idea of translating into Syriac would have occurred to Tatian if he had not already in the West known of Latin translations. It would, however, be beside my present purpose to discuss the interesting questions suggested in this note. All that we are here concerned with is, that it has been put beyond controversy that Tatian acknowledged our four Gospels as the primary sources of a knowledge of the Saviour's life.

* The first formal account of it was given by Harnack in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1881. He had previously, in the same journal, for 1879, p. 401, given a reference to the book without explaining its nature. The book was more largely referred to by Dr. Ezra Abbot, in America, in his *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1880. The first detailed account of it in England was given by Dr. Wace in articles in *The Expositor*, 1882.

the Gospels without title or author's name, and knowing from Eusebius that Tatian had been the author of a harmony, he conjectured that the harmony which he found was Tatian's. This conjecture did not receive much attention until on the publication of Moesinger's work, the coincidences made it apparent that the Latin harmony really was based on Tatian's Diatessaron.* The compiler, however, instead of following Tatian's text, has copied the Vulgate translation of the verses selected. He has also restored the genealogies and corrected some other omissions, so that the Latin harmony is no more than a help towards the restoration of the Diatessaron, and could not singly be relied on for that purpose. But the interest excited by Moesinger's publication has led to the recovery of an Arabic translation of the Diatessaron. One MS. copy had been known to exist in the Vatican Library, and another was lately brought from Egypt to Rome. An edition founded on these two MSS. was printed, with a Latin translation by Ciasca, as a present for the jubilee of Leo XIII., in 1888. The result is, that the obscurity which for so many centuries lay over the Diatessaron has been now in great measure rolled away, and we can speak of its contents with tolerable certainty.†

We find then that it begins, as Bar-Salibi had told us, with the prologue of St. John. It then takes up the first chapter of St. Luke, and so it goes on, passing freely from one Gospel to another, and (I may add) including part of the last

* See Wace's paper referred to, p. 85.

† Using the sources enumerated above, Mr. Hemphill has edited the Diatessaron in an English form (Hodder & Stoughton, 1888). He makes one interesting new observation. Eusebius, as has been mentioned above, had stated that what he calls τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον left by Ammonius of Alexandria had St. Matthew's narrative as its basis. Now, at first sight, this appears not to be the case with Tatian's Diatessaron which, as we have said, begins with the prologue of St. John, passes then to St. Luke, and seems to use all four Gospels on equal terms. But Mr. Hemphill notes that the passages extracted from St. Matthew in this Diatessaron follow, with scarcely an exception, the order of that Gospel, while the extracts from the other Gospels are taken promiscuously. Thus we may conceive the Diatessaron as made by taking St. Matthew's Gospel, leaving out some things, and interpolating others derived from the other Gospels. The idea thus suggests itself, that Tatian's Diatessaron may have been the basis of the harmony of Ammonius, but the total loss of the latter work leaves us without the means of verifying this conjecture. St. Jerome (*Ep.*

chapter of St. John, as to the genuineness of which some very unreasonable doubts have, in modern times, been entertained. If, then, it appears that Justin's pupil, Tatian, used all four Gospels on equal terms, the conclusion at which we had already arrived, that Justin himself did so, is abundantly confirmed.*

VII.

PART IV.

THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

PAPIAS—APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

WE have seen now that in the middle of the second century our four Gospels had obtained their pre-eminence, and enjoyed the distinction of use in the public service of the Church. To-day I go back to an earlier witness, Papias, who was bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the first half of the second century. Although all that we have remaining of him which bears on the subject is half-a-dozen sentences, which happen to have been quoted by Eusebius, countless pages have been written on these fragments; and, what seems not reasonable, almost as much stress has been laid on what they do not mention as on what they do. Indeed, nothing can be more unfair or more absurd than the manner

---

121, *ad Algas.*, i. 860) speaks also of Theophilus of Antioch as the author of a harmony. As we do not hear of this elsewhere, it is commonly supposed that Jerome made a mistake in ascribing to Theophilus the work of Tatian.

* I observe that Dean Burgon refuses to join in the general recognition of the harmony published by Moesinger as Tatian's, and refers to the author as Pseudo-Tatian. But every specialist is in danger of being biassed by the consideration how a decision affects his own subject. A very ancient reading of Matt. xxvii. 49 recorded there the piercing of our Lord's side, now found only in St. John's Gospel, and placed the incident before our Lord's death. On the authority of a scholium which made 'Diodorus and Tatian' responsible for this reading, a plausible explanation was given, that the currency of Tatian's harmony, in which the words of different Evangelists had been mixed together, had, in this instance, led to a transference of an incident related by St. John to an improper place in the first Gospel. But this explanation receives no confirmation from the newly-recovered text of Ephraem. It seems to me that this is not a sufficient reason for discrediting that text.

in which the *argumentum ex silentio* has been urged by sceptical critics in the case of writers of whom we have scarcely any extant remains. The author of 'Supernatural Religion,' for instance, argues: The Gospels of St. Luke and St. John cannot be earlier than the end of the second century, because Hegesippus, because Papias, because Dionysius of Corinth, &c., were unacquainted with them. Well, how do you know that they were unacquainted with them? Because they never mention them. But how do you know that they never mentioned them, seeing that their writings have not come down to us? Because Eusebius does not tell us that they did; and he would have been sure to tell us if they had, for he says that he made it his special business to adduce testimonies to the Canon of Scripture. Now, here is exactly where these writers have misunderstood Eusebius; for the point to which he says he gave particular attention was to adduce testimonies to those books of the Canon *which were disputed in his time*;* and, in one of his papers,† Bishop Lightfoot most satisfactorily shows that this was his practice, by examining the report which Eusebius gives of books which have come down to us. Eusebius tells us (*H. E.* iii. 37) that Clement of Rome used the Epistle to the Hebrews, but never says a word as to his quoting the First Epistle to the Corinthians, though the latter quotation is express (Clem. Rom. 47), and the use of the former Epistle is only inferred from the identity of certain expressions. The explanation plainly is, that there was still some controversy in the time of Eusebius about the Epistle to the Hebrews, and none at all about the Epistles to the Corinthians. In like manner, he tells us (*H. E.* iv. 24) that Theophilus of Antioch used the Revelation of St. John, but never says a word about his quotation of the Gospel; though, as I have already said, Theophilus is the earliest writer now

* The words in which Eusebius states his design (iii. 3) are: *ὑποσημήνασθαι τίνες τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων ὁποίαις κέχρηνται τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, τίνα τε περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων γραφῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων, αὐτοῖς εἴρηται*: that is to say, he undertakes to mention instances of the use of any of the disputed writings together with any statements that he found concerning the composition of any of the writings, whether canonical or not.

† *Contemporary Review*, January, 1875.

extant who mentions John by name as the author of the fourth Gospel. Why so? Plainly because the Revelation was still matter of controversy, and there was no dispute in the time of Eusebius about the fourth Gospel. Other instances of the same kind may be given. Perhaps the most remarkable is the account which Eusebius gives (v. 8) of the use which Irenæus makes of the Holy Scriptures. Eusebius begins the chapter by calling to mind how, at the outset of his history, he had promised to quote the language in which ancient ecclesiastical writers had handed down the tradition which had come to them concerning the canonical Scriptures; and, in fulfilment of this promise, he undertakes to give the language of Irenæus. He then quotes some things said by Irenæus about the four Gospels, something more said by him about the Apocalypse, and then mentions, in general terms, that Irenæus had quoted the First Epistle of John and the First Epistle of Peter, and that he was not only acquainted with the 'Shepherd of Hermas' but accepted it as Scripture. Not a word is said about Irenæus having used the Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul. If the writings of Irenæus had perished, and our knowledge of them had depended on this chapter, he would have been set down as an Ebionite anti-Pauline writer; for it would have been argued that the silence of Eusebius, when expressly undertaking to tell what were the Scriptures used by Irenæus, was conclusive evidence that the latter did not employ the Pauline writings. Actually, however, Irenæus refers to Paul more than two hundred times, and it becomes plain that the reason why Eusebius says nothing about it is, because in his mind it was a matter of course that a Christian should acknowledge St. Paul's Epistles. We see, then, that we have not the slightest reason to expect that Eusebius should go out of his way to adduce testimonies to the Gospels about which no one in his time had any doubt whatever; and, therefore, that no argument against them can be built on his silence.

To return to Papias: it is necessary that you should have before you the facts about Papias in order to enable you to judge of the theories of Renan and others as to the origin of the Gospels. Papias was the author of a book called λογίων

κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, an Exposition* of the oracles of the Lord, of which Eusebius and Irenæus have preserved a very few fragments; and in this is the earliest extant mention of the names of Matthew and Mark as the recognized authors of Gospels. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 36), according to some manuscripts of his work, describes Papias as a man of the greatest erudition, and well skilled in the Scriptures; but it must be owned that this favourable testimony is deficient in manuscript authority; and elsewhere (*H. E.* iii. 39) commenting on some millennarian traditions of his, he remarks that Papias, who was 'a man of very narrow understanding (σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν), as his writings prove,' must have got these opinions from a misunderstanding of the writings of the Apostles. It is a very possible thing for a man of weak judgment to possess considerable learning and a good knowledge of Scripture; and so what Eusebius says in disparagement of Papias in one place does not forbid us to believe that he may have given him some measure of commendation in another. What is the exact date of Papias is uncertain. We know that he lived in the first half of the second century; but some place him at the very beginning; others, not earlier than Justin Martyr. But the chief authority for placing him at the later date has been exploded by Bishop Lightfoot.† The 'Paschal Chronicle,' a compilation of the sixth or seventh century, states that Papias was martyred at Pergamum in the year 164. But coincidences of language clearly show that the compiler is drawing his information from a passage in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, where the martyrdom of one Papylus at Pergamum is mentioned. The confounding of this man with Papias is a mere blunder of the 'Paschal' compiler; and so we are left to gather the date of Papias from his own writings. These clearly show that he lived at a time when it was still thought possible to obtain oral traditions of the facts of our Saviour's life.‡

---

* Or 'Expositions'; for readings vary between the singular and the plural.

† *Contemporary Review*, Aug. 1875, *Colossians*, p. 48.

‡ On this account it seems to me that A.D. 125 or 130 is as late as we can place his work.

I will ask you to attend carefully to what Papias says as to the sources of his information :—'If I met anywhere with anyone who had been a follower of the elders, I used to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, by Peter, by Philip, what by Thomas or James, what by John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; and the things which Aristion and the elder [or presbyter] John, the disciples of the Lord say; for I did not expect to derive so much benefit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice.'* By disciples of our Lord Papias clearly means men who had personal intercourse with him; but it is a point which has been much discussed whether Papias claims to have known the Apostle John. The name John, you will observe, occurs twice over in this extract—'What was said by John or Matthew'; 'what is said by Aristion and John the elder.' The question is, whether he only means to distinguish these last two, concerning whom the present tense is used, as men still surviving; or whether, beside John the Apostle, there was another later John, from whom Papias derived his information; whether, in short, Papias was so early as to have been actually a hearer of the Apostle John, or whether he was separated from him by one link. Eusebius was, I believe, the first to remark the double mention of John, from which he concluded that two Johns were referred to; and those in the third century who denied the Apostolic origin of the Revelation had already suggested that a John different from the Apostle might have been its author. It must, how-

* The following is the extract given by Eusebius from the Preface of Papias: but the student ought to read carefully the whole chapter (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39). He will find the other fragments of Papias in Routh's *Reli. Sac.* i. 8, or in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Apostolic Fathers*, I. ii. 87 :—

Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα, συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἑρμηνείαις, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀληθείαν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί ἀλλὰ τοῖς τἀληθῆ διδάσκουσιν· οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένας τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς, ἢ Ἰάκωβος· ἢ τί Ἰωάννης, ἢ Ματθαῖος, ἤ τὶς ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἅ τε Ἀριστίων, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης.

ever, be borne in mind that the fact that Papias twice mentions the name John does not make it absolutely certain that he meant to speak of two Johns; and there is no other independent witness to the existence of the second. Irenæus (v. xxxiii. 4), in fact, makes no doubt that it was John the Apostle of whom Papias was a disciple; and this view was generally adopted by later ecclesiastical writers.

In order that we may have before us all the facts we are discussing, I will read at once the two passages in which Papias speaks of Matthew and Mark. I told you already that in his fragments we find the first mention of any of our Evangelists by name. On the authority of John the elder Papias writes:—'And this also the elder said: Mark, having become the interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) of Peter, wrote accurately all that he remembered of the things that were either said or done by Christ; but, however, not in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him, but subsequently, as I said,* [attached himself to] Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the immediate wants [of his hearers], but not as making a connected narrative of our Lord's discourses.† So Mark committed no error in thus writing down particulars just as he remembered them; for he took heed to one thing, to omit none of the things that he had heard, and to state nothing falsely in his narrative of them.' Eusebius next gives Papias's statement concerning Matthew:—'Matthew wrote the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in Hebrew, and each one interpreted them as he could.'‡ Eusebius gives no quotation from Papias concerning St. Luke's or St. John's Gospels. He mentions, however, that Papias quoted John's first Epistle; and since that Epistle and the Gospel have evident marks of

* Eusebius states that Papias quoted the First Epistle of Peter; and reasons will be given afterwards for thinking that in the place here referred to Papias quoted 1 Pet. v. 13.

† Or oracles: the reading varies between λόγων and λογίων.

‡ Καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.

common authorship, the presumption is that he who used the one used the other also. The passages I have just quoted were until comparatively modern times regarded as undoubted proofs that Papias knew our present Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Principally on his authority the belief was founded that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Hebrew, and that Mark's Gospel was founded on the preaching of Peter.* But it has been contended by some modern critics that our present first two Gospels do not answer the descriptions given by Papias of the works of which he speaks. You see how hard it is to satisfy the sceptical school of critics. When we produce citations in verbal accordance with our Gospels, they reply, The source of the quotation is not mentioned; how can you be sure that it is taken from your Gospels? Here, when we have a witness who mentions Matthew and Mark by name, they ask, How can you tell whether Papias's Matthew and Mark are the same as the Matthew and Mark we have now?

To the question just raised I am going to pay the compliment of giving it a detailed examination; but I cannot forbear saying that the matter is one in which doubt is wildly unreasonable. Juvenal tells us that the works of Virgil and Horace were in the hands of schoolboys in his time. Who dreams of raising the question whether the works referred to by Juvenal were the same as those we now ascribe to these authors? And yet that a change should be made in books in merely private circulation is a small improbability compared with the improbability that a revolutionary change should be made in books in weekly ecclesiastical use. We have seen that in the time of Justin the Gospels of Matthew

* The dependence of Mark's Gospel upon Peter is also asserted by Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14), who, no doubt, may have had Papias for his authority. It has even been thought that Justin Martyr refers to the second Gospel as Peter's. In the passage quoted, p. 70, where Justin says that our Lord gave to the sons of Zebedee the name Boanerges, he adds that Christ changed the name of one of the Apostles to Peter, and that 'this is written in his memoirs.' Grammatically, this may mean, either Christ's memoirs or Peter's memoirs; and considering that Justin's ordinary name for the Gospels is 'the Memoirs of the Apostles,' some have supposed that he here uses the genitive in the same way, and that he describes the second Gospel (the only one containing the name Boanerges) as the memoirs of the Apostle Peter.

and Mark were weekly read in the Church service. It is absurd to imagine that the liturgical use described by Justin originated in the year his Apology was written. We must in all reason attribute to it some years of previous existence. Again, we must allow a book several years to gain credit and authority, before we can conceive its obtaining admission into Church use. If our present Matthew and Mark supplanted a previous Matthew and Mark, at least the new Gospels would not be stamped with Church authority until so many years had passed that the old ones had had time to be forgotten, and the new to be accepted as the genuine form of Apostolic tradition. Put the work of Papias at its earliest (and I do not find sceptical critics disposed to place it so *very* early), and still the interval between it and Justin's Apology is not adequate to account for the change alleged to have taken place. Observe what is asserted is not that some corruptions crept into the text of the Gospels ascribed to Matthew and Mark, but that a change was made in them altering their entire character. And we are asked to believe that no one remonstrated, that the old Gospels perished out of memory, without leaving a trace behind, and that the new ones reigned in their stead, without anyone finding out the difference! I shall afterwards have to consider speculations as to the process by which it is imagined floating traditions as to the Saviour's life crystallized into the form of our present Gospels. What I say now is, that the interval between Papias and Justin is altogether too short to leave room for such a process. The mention by Papias of Matthew and Mark by name is evidence enough that in his time these Gospels had already taken their definite form; for it is inconceivable that if anyone in the second century had presumed to remodel a Gospel which bore the name, and was believed to be the work, of an Apostle, there would not be many who would prefer and preserve the older form. I am persuaded, then, that interpreters of the words of Papias get on an entirely wrong track if, instead of patiently examining what opinion concerning our present Gospels his words indicate, they fly off to imagine some other Matthew and Mark, to which his words shall be more applicable.

Once more, I may take a hint from our opponents, and, with better reason than they, build an argument on the silence of Eusebius. He had before him the whole book, which we only know by two or three extracts; and no passage in it suggested to him that Papias used different Gospels from ours, or that he even used an extra-canonical Gospel. Now, although Eusebius is apt to see nothing calling for remark when an ecclesiastical writer expresses the opinion which the later Church generally agreed to hold, he takes notice readily enough of any divergence from that opinion. For instance, in his account of the Ignatian Letters he takes no notice of a couple of fairly accurate quotations from our Gospels; but he singles out for remark the only passage suggesting a possible use of a different source. (*H. E.* iii. 36; Ignat. *Smyrn.* 3.)

To return now to the reasons alleged for facing so many improbabilities, it is urged that there is a striking resemblance between the Gospels of Matthew and Mark as we have them now, but that Papias's description would lead us to think of them as very different. Matthew's Gospel was, according to him, a Hebrew work, containing an account only of our Lord's discourses; for so Schleiermacher* would have us translate τὰ λόγια, the word which I have rendered 'oracles.' Mark, on the other hand, wrote in Greek, and recorded what was done as well as what was said by Christ—τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Again, Mark's Gospel, which in its present state has the same claims to orderly arrangement as Matthew's, was, according to Papias, not written in order. The conclusion, then, which has been drawn from these premisses, is that Papias's testimony does not relate to our present Gospels of Matthew and Mark, but to certain unknown originals, out of which these Gospels have sprung; and in some books of the sceptical school the 'original Matthew' and 'original Mark' (Ur-Markus) are constantly spoken of, though there is no particle of evidence, beyond that which I have laid before you, that there ever was any Gospel by Matthew and Mark different from those we have got.

* Schleiermacher (1768-1834), Professor of Theology at Halle, and afterwards at Berlin. His essay on the testimony of Papias to our first two Gospels appeared in the *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1832.

Thus, according to Renan, Papias was in possession of two documents quite different from one another—a collection of our Lord's discourses made by Matthew, and a collection of anecdotes taken down by Mark from Peter's recollections; and Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. xxii.) thus describes the process by which Matthew's Gospel gradually absorbed Mark's anecdotes, and Mark's derived a multitude of features from the 'Logia' of Matthew:—'As it was thought the world was near its end, men were little anxious about composing books for the future: all they aimed at was to keep in their hearts the living image of Him whom they hoped soon to see again in the clouds. Hence the small authority which the evangelic texts enjoyed for one hundred and fifty years.* No scruple was felt as to inserting additions in them, combining them diversely, and completing one by another.' The passage I am reading illustrates the character of Renan's whole book, in which he trusts far more to his power of divination than to evidence, his statements being often supported by the slenderest authority. Thus, for this statement that for a century men had no scruple in transposing, combining, and interpolating the evangelic records, there is not a shadow of proof. Renan goes on to say:—'The poor man who has only one book wants it to contain everything which goes to his heart. These little books were lent by one to another. Each transcribed in the margin of his copy the words, the parables, which he found elsewhere, and which touched him. Thus has the finest thing in the world issued from a process worked out unobserved and quite unauthoritatively.'† In this way we are to suppose that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, which were originally unlike, came, by a process of mutual assimilation, to their present state of resemblance.

If this theory were true, we should expect to find in early times a multitude of Gospels, differing in their order and in their selection of facts, according as the different possessors of manuscripts had differently inserted the discourses or events which touched their hearts. In the more ancient manuscripts the order of the events would become uncertain.

* Later editions, 'nearly one hundred.'

† 'La plus belle chose du monde est ainsi sortie d'une élaboration obscure et complétement populaire.

It would even be doubtful to which Gospel this or that story should be referred. Why we should have now exactly four versions of the story is not easy to explain. We should expect that, by the process of mutual assimilation which has been described, all would, in the end, have been reduced to a single Gospel. Attempts would surely have been made to bring the order of the different Evangelists to uniformity. If one 'poor man' had written an anecdote in his manuscript in a wrong place, another would not scruple to change it.

But the fact is that our four Gospels are as distinct, and the order of the events as definite, in the earliest manuscripts as in the latest; and if such variations as I have described had ever prevailed, it is incredible that no trace of them should be found in any existing authority. The two Gospels of Matthew and Mark, with all their likeness, remain quite distinct as far as we can trace them back. Nor is there the slightest uncertainty as to the order of narration of either. One solitary fact is appealed to by Renan in his note as the sole basis for his monstrous theory. The section of St. John's Gospel which contains the story of the woman taken in adultery is, as you probably know, wanting in the most ancient manuscripts; in a few copies it is absent from the place where it occurs in the received text, but is added at the end of the Gospel; and in five manuscripts of comparatively late date, which, however, show evident marks of having been copied from a common original, it is inserted in St. Luke's Gospel at the end of the 21st chapter. It would be out of place to discuss here the genuineness of this particular passage.* Critics generally regard it as an authentic fragment of apostolic tradition, but not as a genuine part of St. John's Gospel. But now it is manifest that the phenomena which present themselves in a small degree in the case of this story would, if Renan's theory were true, show themselves in a multitude of cases. There would be a multitude of parables and miracles with respect to which we should be uncertain whether they

* Eusebius gives us some reason to think that the story of the adulteress was related in the work of Papias. If, as Lightfoot conjectures, it was told in illustration of our Lord's words, 'I judge no man' (John viii. 15), we have an explanation how the paragraph has come to be inserted in the particular place in which we find it.

were common to all the Evangelists or special to one, and what place in that one they ought to occupy. Further, according to the hypothesis stated, Mark's design was more comprehensive than Matthew's. Matthew only related our Lord's discourses; Mark, the things said or done by Christ—that is to say, both discourses and actions of Jesus. If this were so, it might be expected that Mark's Gospel would differ from Matthew's by excess, and Matthew's would read like a series of extracts from Mark's. Exactly the opposite is the case.

But I wholly disbelieve that the word λόγια in the extract from Papias is rightly translated 'the speeches of our Lord.' Not to speak of the absurdity of supposing a collection of our Lord's sayings to have been made without any history of the occasions on which they were spoken, λόγια is one word, λόγοι another. Examine for yourselves the four passages in which the former word occurs in the New Testament:—Acts vii. 38, 'Moses received the lively oracles to give unto us;' Rom. iii. 2, 'To the Jews were committed the oracles of God;' Heb. v. 12, 'Ye have need that we teach you which be the first principles of the oracles of God;' and lastly, 1 Peter iv. 11, 'If anyone speak let him speak as the oracles of God.' Now, when Paul, for example, says that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God, can we imagine that he confines this epithet to those parts of the Old Testament which contained Divine sayings, and that he excludes those narrative parts from which he has himself so often drawn lessons in his Epistles; as, for instance, the account of the creation which he uses, 1 Cor. xi. 8; the account of the fall, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 14; the wanderings in the wilderness, 1 Cor. x. 1; the story of Sarah and Hagar, Gal. iv. 21; or the saying (Gen. xv. 6) that 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness,' of which such use is made both in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians. Thus we find that in the New Testament λόγια has its classical meaning, 'oracles,' and is applied to the inspired utterances of God in His Holy Scriptures. This is also the meaning the word bears in the Apostolic Fathers and in other Jewish writers. Philo quotes as a λόγιον, an

oracle of God, the *narrative* in Gen. iv. 15, 'The Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him;' and as another oracle the words, Deut. x. 9, 'The Lord is his inheritance.' The quotations from latter writers, who use the word λόγια generally as inspired books, are too abundant to be cited. We must recollect also that the title of Papias's own work is λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις,* while it is manifest that the book was not confined to treating of our Lord's discourses. I consider the true conclusion to be, that as we find from Justin that the Gospels were put on a level with the Old Testament in the public reading of the Church, so we find from Papias that the name λόγια, the oracles, given to the Old Testament Scriptures, was also given to the Gospels, which were called τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια, the oracles of our Lord. The title of Papias's own work I take as meaning simply 'an exposition of the *Gospels*;' and his statement about Matthew I take as meaning: 'Matthew composed his *Gospel* in Hebrew,' the word λόγια implying its Scriptural authority. I do not know any passage where λόγια means discourses; and I believe the notion that Matthew's Gospel was originally only a collection of speeches to be a mere dream. Indeed the theory of an original Matthew containing speeches, and an original Mark containing acts, has been so worked out that the best rationalist critics now recognize its absurdity. For it was noticed that our present Matthew contains a great deal of history not to be found in our present Mark; and that our present Luke contains a great many discourses not to be found in Matthew; and so the theory led to the whimsical result of critics looking for the original Matthew in St. Luke, and for the original Mark in St. Matthew.

A more careful examination of what Papias says leads us, I am convinced, to a very different conclusion. On reading what Papias says about Mark's Gospel, two things are

* 'If there were any doubt as to the meaning of this title, it would be removed by the words of Irenæus in the preface to his treatise. Certain, he says, παράγουσι τὸν νοῦν τῶν ἀπειροτέρων, . . . ῥᾳδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια κυρίου, ἐξηγηταὶ κακοὶ τῶν καλῶς εἰρημένων γινόμενοι. Papias wished to combat false interpretations of the "oracles" by true.'—Westcott, *N. T. Canon*, p. 577.

apparent—first, Papias had a strong belief in Mark's perfect accuracy. Three times in this short fragment he asserts it: 'Mark wrote down accurately everything he remembered;' 'Mark committed no error;' 'He made it his rule not to omit anything he heard, or to set down any false statement therein.' Secondly, that Papias was for some reason dissatisfied with Mark's arrangement, and thought it necessary to apologize for it. No account of this passage is satisfactory which will not explain why, if Papias reverenced Mark so much, he was dissatisfied with his order. Here Renan's hypothesis breaks down at once—the hypothesis, namely, that Papias was in possession of only two documents, and these totally different in their nature: the one a collection of discourses, and the other a collection of anecdotes. Respecting, as he did, Mark's accuracy, Papias would assuredly have accepted his order had he not been in possession of some other document, to which for some reason he attached more value in this particular—a document going over somewhat the same ground as Mark's, but giving the facts in different order. It is clear that the Mark of which Papias was in possession did not merely consist of loose collections of unconnected anecdotes of our Lord's life, but was a Gospel aiming at some orderly arrangement. It was not the case that the copies of this Gospel so differed from each other as to make it uncertain what was the order in which it gave the facts. This order was definite, and though Papias was dissatisfied with it, and tried to explain why it was not different, he never maintained that Mark had originally written the facts in any different or preferable order. And it is clear that he had more such Gospels than one, namely, at the least, St. Mark's Gospel, and some other Gospel, with whose order he compared St. Mark's, and found it different.

The question then remains to be answered: If Papias held that Mark's Gospel was not written in the right order, what was, in his opinion, the right order? Strauss considers and rejects three answers to this question, as being all inadmissible, at least on the supposition that the Gospel known to Papias as St. Mark's was the same as that which we receive under that name. These answers are: first, that the

right order was St. John's; secondly, that the right order was St. Matthew's; thirdly, that Papias meant to deny to Mark the merit not only of the right order, but of any historical arrangement whatever. Of these three solutions, the first—that the right order in Papias's mind was St. John's—is that defended with great ability by Bishop Lightfoot. Besides these there remains another, which I believe to be the true one, namely, that what Papias regarded as the right order was St. Luke's. The reason, I suppose, why this solution has been thought unworthy of discussion is, that no mention of St. Luke is made in any of the fragments of Papias which have reached us; from which it has been assumed to be certain that Papias was unacquainted with Luke's writings. Now, if we had the whole work of Papias, and found he had said nothing about St. Luke, it might be reasonable to ask us to account for his silence; but when we have only remaining some very brief extracts from his book, it seems ludicrous to conclude that Papias was ignorant of St. Luke, merely because Eusebius found in his work no statement concerning Luke which he thought worth copying. With regard to Matthew and Mark, Eusebius found the statements that Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and these he thought worth preserving; but if Papias added nothing to what was known about Luke, we can understand why Eusebius should not have copied any mention of Luke by Papias. The fragments preserved contain clear traces that Papias was acquainted with the Acts, and since, as we have seen, Luke's Gospel was certainly known to Justin Martyr, who was not so much later than Papias that both may not have been alive at the same time, the conclusion that it was known by Papias also is intrinsically most probable. When, therefore, in explaining the language used by Papias, we have to choose between the hypothesis that he was acquainted with Luke's Gospel, and the hypothesis that the Matthew and Mark known to Papias perished without leaving any trace of their existence, and were in the next generation silently replaced by another Matthew and Mark, the former hypothesis is plainly to be preferred, if it will give an equally good account of the pheno-

mena. Since we know from Justin that it was the custom to read the Gospels every Sunday in the Christian assemblies, the notion that one of these could have been utterly lost, and another under the same name substituted, is as extravagant a supposition as can well be imagined.

In support of my opinion that Papias knew St. Luke, I may quote an authority above suspicion—Hilgenfeld, who may be pronounced a leader of the present German Rationalist school. His notion is that Papias was acquainted with Luke's Gospel, but did not ascribe to it the same authority as to Matthew and Mark. And his opinion, that Papias knew St. Luke, is founded on a comparison of the preface to Luke's Gospel with the preface to Papias's work, in which he finds many phrases which seem to him an echo of St. Luke. I am disposed to think he is right; but the resemblance is not striking enough to convince anyone inclined to deny it. Lightfoot comes to the same conclusion on different grounds, namely, on account of a striking coincidence between one of the fragments of Papias and Luke x. 18.

But if we assume that Papias recognized St. Luke's Gospel, the language which he uses with respect to St. Mark's is at once accounted for. The preface to St. Luke's Gospel declares it to be the Evangelist's intention to write in order—γράψαι καθεξῆς, but a reader could not go far without finding out that Luke's order is not always the same as Mark's. In the very first chapter of St. Mark the healing of Peter's wife's mother is placed after the Apostle's call to become a fisher of men, in opposition to Luke's order. It is on this difference of order that, as I understand the matter, Papias undertook to throw light by his traditional anecdotes. And his account of the matter is that Mark was but the interpreter of Peter, whose teaching he accurately reported; that Peter had not undertaken to give any orderly account of our Lord's words or deeds; that he only delivered these instructions from time to time as the needs of his people required; and that Mark was, therefore, guilty of no falsification in faithfully reporting what he had heard.

We have no evidence that Papias's notice about St. Matthew occurred in the same context as that about St. Mark; but I

think it likely that this remark was also made in explanation of an apparent disagreement between the first Gospel and one of the others. And I conceive Papias's solution of the difficulty to be, that the Church was not then in possession of the Gospel as Matthew wrote it—that the Greek Matthew was but an unauthorized translation from a Hebrew original, which each one had translated for himself as he could. Thus, in place of its being true that Papias did not use our present Gospels, I believe the truth to be that he was the first who attempted to harmonize them, assuming the principle that no apparent disagreement between them could affect their substantial truth.

Thus, then, these explanations lead to the same inference as the use of the word λόγια in speaking of St. Matthew's Gospel; both indicate that Papias regarded the Gospels as really inspired utterances. When he finds what seems a disagreement between the Gospels, he is satisfied there can be no real disagreement. Mark's order may be different from Luke's; but, then, that was because it was not Mark's design to recount the facts in their proper order. Three times over he repeats that Mark committed no error, but wrote all things truly. If in Matthew's Gospel, as he read it, there seemed any inaccuracy, this must be imputed to the translators; the Gospel as Matthew himself wrote it was free from fault.

Weighing these things, I have convinced myself that Bishop Lightfoot has given the true explanation of a passage, from which an erroneous inference has been drawn. Papias declares, in a passage which I have already cited, 'If I met with anyone who had been a follower of the elders anywhere, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders, what was said by Andrew, by Peter, by Philip, what by Thomas or James, what by John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord, and the things which Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, say; for I did not think that I could get so much benefit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice.' The question is: Does this disparagement of written books extend to our Gospels? Are we to suppose that Papias regarded these books, if he had them, as in no sense inspired,

and that he preferred to obtain his knowledge of the Saviour's earthly life from *viva voce* tradition? Considering his solicitude to clear the Gospels from all charge of inaccuracy, I feel convinced that these were not the writings which he found comparatively useless to him for his work. The title of his book was, as I understand it, 'An Exposition of the Gospels;' and it was in seeking for traditions to supplement and illustrate the Scripture history that he found it useless to search the Gnostic interpretations* then current, and that he preferred his own collection of *viva voce* traditions, whose genuineness could, as he alleged, be proved by tracing them up, like the four Gospels, to the Apostles themselves.

It is worth while to take notice also of the commencement of the preface of Papias: 'I shall not scruple also to place along with my interpretations anything that I carefully learned from the elders.' Here we have in the first rank, as the object of Papias's work, expositions of the oracles of our Lord—*interpretations;* that is to say, he assumes an existing authoritative text, on which he comments, and which he tries to explain; and then, with a little apology, he takes leave to put his *traditions* forward as on the same level with his interpretations. But neither one nor the other seems to come into competition with the text. Those who would have us believe that Papias preferred his traditions to the Evangelic text forget that he tells us the two things—that he was in possession of a book written by Matthew, and that he also made it his business to inquire from anyone who could tell him what Matthew had said. Papias must have been even of weaker understanding than Eusebius would lead us to think, if he regarded hearsay reports as better evidence what were the statements of Matthew than the testimony of a book which he believed to have been written by that Apostle. But Papias might fairly retort the charge of stupidity on his critics. He had called Matthew's

* Basilides, apparently a contemporary of Papias, is said to have written twenty-four books on the Gospel (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7). Two fragments of these *Exegetica* have been preserved: one by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 12), the other in the 'Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus and Manes' (Routh, *Rell. Sac.* v. 196). These extracts make it probable that the Gospel of St. Luke was one of the books on which Basilides commented.

book the 'Logia,' and his own book an interpretation of 'Logia.' To find a parallel case, then, we must imagine a writer of the present day publishing a commentary on the 'In Memoriam,' and stating in his preface that he had taken pains to question everyone that he met with who had conversed with the Laureate, and that he regarded the interpretations he had thus been able to collect as more valuable than anything he had seen in print. What should we think of a reviewer who, reading no further than the preface, should report that the author maintained that none of the printed editions of Tennyson's Poems could be relied on, and that he attached no value to anything save certain stanzas he had heard in conversation to have been recited by the poet?

On the whole, then, I arrive at the conclusion that Papias recognized an Evangelic text, to which he ascribed the highest authority, and in the perfect accuracy of which he had strong faith. In my own mind I have no doubt that this text consisted of the four Gospels we now have. Papias has named two of his Gospels, those of St. Matthew and St. Mark; and I see no ground for imagining that these names totally changed their signification in the course of a generation. With regard to the use of St. John's Gospel by Papias, the presumption arising from his confessed use of the First Epistle is confirmed by several indications in the list of names already quoted. Andrew is placed before Peter, as in John i. 44 (compare Mark i. 29); Philip and Thomas are selected for mention, who have no prominence except in St. John's Gospel; Matthew and John are coupled together, the simplest explanation of which is that both were known to Papias as authors of Gospels. In the context of this list, Papias calls our Lord by the Johannine title of 'the Truth.' And Lightfoot gives strong reasons for thinking Papias to be the author of a passage quoted anonymously by Irenæus, and which contains a quotation from St. John. Lightfoot's reasons have been accepted as convincing by an unprejudiced critic, Harnack. Of Papias's use of St. Luke's Gospel I have spoken already, and we shall not doubt that he recognized this Gospel if we afterwards find reason to think that he was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles.

If still earlier evidence than that of Papias is required, the only difficulty is that the books from which we might have drawn our testimony have perished. The extant remains of earlier Christian literature are few; and, indeed, it is likely that the first generation of Christians, among whom there were not many learned, and who were in constant expectation of their Master's second coming, did not give birth to many books. As to the remains we do possess, I avoid burdening your memory with too many details, and I will only quote a specimen from him who is accounted the earliest of uninspired writers, Clement of Rome, in order to show the kind of testimony which those who are known as the Apostolic Fathers afford: 'Remember the words of our Lord Jesus, for he said, Woe to that man; it were better for him that he had not been born than that he should offend one of my elect. It were better for him that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of my little ones' (Clem. Rom. 46). Elsewhere he says: 'Especially remembering the words of our Lord Jesus, which he spake, teaching gentleness and long-suffering. For thus he said, Be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy: forgive, that it may be forgiven to you. As ye do, so shall it be done unto you: as ye give, so shall it be given unto you: as ye judge, so shall ye be judged: as ye show kindness, so shall kindness be shown unto you: with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be measured unto you' (*Ch.* 13). Similar quotations are found in the Letters of Polycarp and Ignatius, but the passages I have read illustrate the two characteristics of these early citations—first, that they do not mention the name of the source whence they are taken; secondly, that, though they substantially agree with passages in our present Gospels, they do not do so literally and verbally. There are two questions, then, to be settled—First: Is the writer quoting from a written source at all, or is he merely using oral traditions of our Lord's sayings and doings? Secondly: Is he using our Gospels, or some other record of our Saviour's life? It seems to me that the words '*Remember* the words of our Lord Jesus,' when addressed to the members of a distant Church who had received

no oral instructions from the writer, point distinctly, not to oral tradition, but a written record, which Clement could know to be recognized as well by those whom he was addressing as by himself. St. Paul, addressing the Ephesian elders, might say, 'Remember the words of our Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive' (Acts xx. 35), although these words do not occur in our Gospel history, because he had taught for three years in Ephesus, and therefore had the means of knowing that his readers had heard the same words before. But the words, 'Remember the words of our Lord Jesus,' when addressed to men, as to the oral instruction delivered to whom the writer apparently had no means of knowledge, point, in my opinion, plainly to written sources of information. And it appears to me unreasonable to suppose that these written sources of information were works which have disappeared, and not those works to which we find testimonies very little less ancient than the quotations to which I refer, and which contain the passages cited, the verbal differences not exceeding those that are commonly found in *memoriter* quotations. I have already spoken of the degree of accuracy that may reasonably be looked for in the *memoriter* quotations of the very early Fathers.

But, before parting with the Apostolic Fathers, I must produce a passage which illustrates the skill of critics in resisting evidence produced to prove something which they have, on *a priori* grounds, decided not to admit. There are those who have made up their minds that the Gospels are comparatively late compositions, and who are certain that they could not, for a long time, have been looked on as inspired or treated as Scripture. Now, the Epistle of Barnabas is a work which, though not likely to have been written by the Apostle Barnabas, is owned on all hands to be one of great antiquity, dating from the end of the first century, or at least the beginning of the second,* a period at which, according to some of our opponents, St. Matthew's Gospel was perhaps not written, and at any rate could not yet have been counted as Scripture. But this Epistle contains (c. 4) the

* Hilgenfeld dates it A.D. 97.

exhortation, 'Let us take heed lest, as it is written, we be found, many called, but few chosen.' Here we have a plain quotation from St. Matthew, introduced with the well-known formula of Scripture citation, 'It is written.' But this part of the Epistle of Barnabas was till lately only extant in a Latin translation; hence it was said that it was impossible that these words, 'It is written,' could have been in the original Greek. They must have been an interpolation of the Latin translator. Hilgenfeld, in an early work,* went so far as to admit that the Greek text contained some formula of citation, but he had no doubt it must have been 'as Jesus says,' or some such like. Unfortunately, however, lately the Greek text of this portion of the Epistle of Barnabas came to light, being part of the newly-discovered Sinaitic Manuscript, and there stands the 'as it is written,' ὡς γέγραπται, beyond mistake. Then it was suggested that the quotation is not from St. Matthew, but from the second book of Esdras. Now, it is a question whether this book is not post-Christian (as certainly some portions of the present text of it are), and possibly later than St. Matthew—say as late as the end of the first century. But the words there are, 'Many are created, but few shall be saved.' The contention that the words 'Many are called, but few chosen,' are not from St. Matthew, but from this passage, though this itself may have been derived from our Gospels, is only a proof of the straits to which our opponents are reduced. Then it was suggested that the quotation was perhaps from some lost apocryphal book. And lately a more plausible solution, though itself sufficiently desperate, has been discovered. Scholten† suggests that the phrase 'It is written' was used by Barnabas through a lapse of memory. The words 'many are called, but few chosen,' ran in his head, and he had forgotten where he had read them, and fancied it was somewhere in the Old Testament. I think this is an excellent illustration of the difficulty of convincing a man against his will.

* 'Die apostolischen Väter,' p. 48 (1853).

† Scholten (born 1811), Emeritus Professor of the University of Leyden, a representative of the extreme school of revolutionary criticism.

VIII.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

Part I.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THEIR ANTIQUITY.

WE have now traced back, as far as we had any materials, the history of the reception of the Gospels in the Church; and have found no sign that the existing tradition concerning their authorship has ever varied.*

One remark I must make as to what that tradition exactly was. Renan observes (p. xvi) that the formulæ 'according to Matthew,' 'according to Mark,' &c., indicate that the earliest opinion was, not that these stories were written from one end to the other by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, but only that they contain traditions emanating from these respective sources and guaranteed by their authority.† But assuredly if that had been what was intended by the phrase 'according to,' the second and third Gospels would have been known as the Gospel according to Peter, and the Gospel according to Paul. The account of Papias, that Mark did nothing but record narrations of Peter concerning our Lord,

* The student who desires to see the evidence of the early use of the Gospels in fuller detail will find valuable assistance in Anger's 'Synopsis.' It is an arrangement of the Evangelic text in the form of a harmony, and aims at giving in connexion with each passage any illustrative parallel to be found in writers earlier than Irenæus.

† I observe that Renan has struck this sentence out of his later editions, which, I suppose, is to be regarded as a confession that the argument it contained cannot be relied on.

was received with general belief by the early Church.* And it was just as generally believed that the third Gospel rested on the authority of St. Paul. Irenæus, for instance, says (III. i.) —'Paul's follower, Luke, put in a book the Gospel preached by him.' Some ancient interpreters even understand the phrase 'according to my Gospel,' which occurs in the Pauline Epistles† to refer to the Gospel according to St. Luke (Euseb., *H. E.* iii. 4). Clearly, then, if the phrase 'according to' had been understood to imply anything less than actual authorship, the Church would never have been content to designate these Gospels by the names of those who transmitted the tradition at second-hand, but would have named them more honourably after the great Apostles on whose authority they were believed to rest. It is plain, then, that the phrase 'the Gospel according to' indicates only the Church's sense of the unity of the fourfold narrative, the same good tidings being contained in all, only presented differently by different hands.

Thus, though Justin Martyr uses the word Gospel in the plural number, speaking of the 'Memoirs' that are called Gospels (see p. 65), and Irenæus also speaks of four Gospels, and tries to prove that there could neither be more nor fewer, yet the use is quite as early of the word Gospel in the singular number to denote the entire record of the Saviour's life. Thus we find in Justin Martyr, 'the precepts in what is called the Gospel' (*Trypho*, c. 10), 'it is written in the Gospel' (c. 100). In the passage of Irenæus to which I have just referred, though he does occasionally use the plural number, yet the singular prevails, and it would be more accurate to state his thesis as 'The Gospel is essentially fourfold,' rather than as 'There can be only four Gospels.' And he habitually uses the form of citation 'as it is written in the Gospel,'‡ and so do other early writers. Clement of Alex-

* See note, p. 93. Clement states (*l. c.*) that the tradition which had reached him was, that the Gospels containing the genealogies had been written first, and that Mark afterwards wrote his Gospel at Rome at the request of Peter's hearers, who desired to have a permanent record of the Gospel orally preached by that Apostle; Peter himself not interfering either to forbid or encourage the design.

† Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8; see also 2 Thess. ii. 14.

‡ For example: II. xxvi. 2; III. xxiii. 3; IV. xx. 6.

andria speaks of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel (*Strom.* iii. 70; iv. 2, 91). Accordingly the earliest MSS. represent the Gospels not as four separate works, but as one work bearing the title 'Gospel,' divided into four sections, 'according to Matthew,' 'according to Mark,' &c. These were, in short, but the forms in which four different Evangelists had committed *the* Gospel to writing.* And so St. Augustine speaks of 'the four Gospels, or rather the four books of the one Gospel.'†

The titles of the Gospels regarded in another point of view prove their own historic character. If they had been arbitrarily chosen, we may be sure that persons of greater distinction in the history of the Church would have been selected. Matthew is one of the least prominent of the Apostles, and the dignity of Apostleship is not even claimed for Mark and Luke. It would have been so easy to claim a more distinguished authorship for the Gospels, that we have the less right to refuse credence to what is actually claimed, namely, that the two Evangelists just named, though not Apostles, and possibly not even eyewitnesses themselves, were in immediate contact with Apostles and eyewitnesses.

It remains, then, to test this tradition by internal evidence. When we examine the Gospels with a critical eye, do we find reason to think that they cannot be so early as the date claimed for them, viz. the first age of the Church—the age when Apostles and other eyewitnesses of our Saviour's ministry were still alive and accessible to the writers of these narratives? If we reflect for a moment we shall be convinced that in that early age there must have been Gospels: if not the Gospels we know, at least some other Gospels. Two things may be regarded as certain in the history of our religion: first, that it spread with extraordinary rapidity—that within twenty or thirty years of our Lord's death the Gospel had travelled far outside the borders of Palestine, so that there were Christians in widely separated cities; and, secondly, that the main subject of the preaching of every

* I take this to be what is intended in the account of Irenæus (III. i.) *Λουκᾶς τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο· ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διατρίβων.*

† *Tract in Joan.*, xxxvi. vol. III. 543.

missionary of the Church was Jesus Christ. Numerous passages will rise to your minds in which the work of these first missionaries is described as 'preaching Christ.' St. Luke says of the Apostles at Jerusalem, 'Daily in the temple and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ' (Acts v. 42). When persecution scattered away the disciples from Jerusalem, St. Luke tells us of those who came to Antioch and spoke to the Grecians, 'preaching the Lord Jesus' (Acts xi. 20). 'We preach not ourselves,' says St. Paul (2 Cor. iv. 5), 'but Christ Jesus the Lord.' Whatever were the dissensions in the early Church, of which we now hear so much, they did not affect this point. 'Some,' says St. Paul (Phil. i. 15), 'preach Christ even of envy and strife, and some also of goodwill;' but 'every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached.' The zeal of the first disciples made every Christian a missionary into whatever town he went; and the work of the missionary was, as we have seen, to preach a person. Consequently the preacher must have been prepared to answer the questions, Who was this Jesus whom you preach? What did he do? What did he teach? And since the preachers could rarely answer these questions from their personal knowledge, it was a necessity for their work that they should be furnished with authentic answers resting on a higher authority than their own. We cannot doubt, then, that the first age of the Church must have had its Gospels, and the question is whether we are bound to reject the claim of these books of ours to have been, at least, among the number.

When I discussed the external evidences to the Gospels, I considered all four together; for my judgment is that, with respect to external evidence, there is no appreciable difference between them. But the internal characteristics of the fourth Gospel are so different from those of the other three, and the special objections made against it so numerous, that it will be necessary to consider this Gospel separately. I shall, therefore, now speak only of the first three, commonly called the Synoptic Gospels—a title which is so well established that it is now too late to discuss its propriety.*

* The idea is that these Gospels agree in giving one synopsis or general view of the same series of events.

There is one class of passages in these Gospels on which the stamp of antiquity is impressed so deeply as to leave no room for dispute: I mean those which record discourses of our Lord. That the report of these discourses is substantially accurate no unprejudiced critic can doubt. Renan speaks of the 'naturalness, the ineffable truth, the matchless charm of the Synoptic discourses; their profoundly Hebrew turn; the analogies they present to the sayings of Jewish doctors of the same time; their perfect harmony with the scenery of Galilee' (p. xxx). Elsewhere (p. xxxvii) he says, 'A kind of brilliancy at once mild and terrible, a divine force, underlines these words, if I may say so, detaches them from the context, and enables the critic easily to recognize them.' 'The true words of Jesus, so to say, reveal themselves. When they are touched in this chaos of traditions of unequal authenticity we feel them vibrate. They come, we may say, spontaneously to take their places in our story, where they stand out in striking relief.'

Indeed, I need hardly quote the testimony of Renan or of anybody else; for we have sufficient evidence of the substantial truthfulness of the Gospel report of our Lord's discourses in the fact that in all Christian literature there is nothing like them. If, instead of simply reporting these discourses, the first disciples had invented them, they could have invented something else of the same kind. Actually, it is a little surprising that the men who were so deeply impressed by our Lord's teaching, and who so fully imbibed the spirit of it, should never have attempted to imitate its form. In point of style, we travel into a new country when we pass from the Synoptic Gospels to the Apostolic Epistles. Those who heard our Lord's parables, and who could not fail to have been struck by their beauty, and by the force with which they brought to the mind the lessons they were meant to convey, never, as far as we know, used the same method of impressing any lessons of their own. Among early uninspired Christian writers there were several imitators of the Apostolic Epistles, but only one, Hermas, who attempted to imitate the parables, and that with such poor success that we need the less wonder that others did not try the experiment.

Thus we see, that if tradition had been silent, criticism would have told us the story that tradition now tells: 'There are things here which must either have been written down by men who heard Jesus of Nazareth speak, or else by men who faithfully transmitted the account given to them by the actual hearers.' And we have every reason also to think that no great time could have elapsed before the recollections of our Lord's teaching were reduced to a permanent form. Certainly those who exclude miracle, and who look upon our Lord merely as an eminent teacher, cannot otherwise account for the substantial faithfulness of the evangelistic record of His discourses. A few detached aphorisms of a great teacher may be carried by the memory for some time, and be passed on from one to another; but discourses of the length we find in the Gospels would, in the ordinary course of things, have perished, if they had not been from the first either committed to writing, or, if committed to memory, kept alive by constant repetition. It is surprising how little of spoken words ordinary memories are able to retain. I believe that anyone who has been much in the company of a distinguished man will, on his death, be astonished to find how extremely little in the way of reminiscences of his conversation he will be able to recall. If Boswell has been able to give a vivid representation of Dr. Johnson's Table-Talk, it is because he used to stand behind the chair of the object of his veneration, with note-book in hand. And it was in the same way that Luther's Table-Talk was preserved. It is quite true that some memories are exceptionally retentive, and true also that the words of Jesus were of surpassing interest. All however that follows from this is, that it is not necessary to conclude that our Lord's discourses were written down in His own lifetime: but it seems to me not rational to suppose that, if any long time had passed after the day of Pentecost before his discourses were reduced to a permanent form, they could have been preserved to us with so much faithfulness and so much purity.

Nor do I think that the case is altered when we look at the matter from a Christian point of view. We believe that the Apostles were aided by the Holy Spirit, who brought to

their memories the things that Jesus had said. But we have no reason to think that this assistance was bestowed on such terms as to relieve them from the duty of taking ordinary precautions for the preservation of what was thus recalled to their minds.

I hold it, then, to be certain that the existing Gospels contain elements which are, in the highest sense of the word, Apostolic; and the present question is, Are we to confine this character to that part of them which records our Lord's discourses? Are we to suppose that the Apostles carefully remembered and accurately reported what Jesus *said*, and that they neglected the easier task of recording what he *did*? or was this a point on which their hearers would not be curious for information? No one can answer this or any other historical question rightly who projects his own feelings into the minds of men who lived centuries ago. A nineteenth-century critic may be deeply impressed by the excellence and beauty of the moral teaching ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth. He very willingly grants that it would be inconceivable that four illiterate Jews should each independently arrive at a degree of wisdom far surpassing that obtained by any other of their nation; and so he may readily accept their own account of the matter, namely, that all had obtained their wisdom from one common source. But the modern critic does not care to hear of miracles; and he would, if possible, prefer to believe that one in other respects so admirable as Jesus had made no pretensions to supernatural power. But it is absurd to imagine that this was the frame of mind of the first disciples. Who can conceive of them as men only solicitous to hear what had been the words of Jesus, and indifferent to the report of His works? I have said that the first Christian missionaries summarized their work as 'preaching Christ.' And if we look at the specimens of their teaching, whether as presented in the book of the Acts or in the unquestioned Apostolic Epistles, we see that this meant far less preaching what Christ had said than what He had done. The character in which He is presented is not that of a wise moral teacher, but of one 'anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went

about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil.' Look at any of the places in the Epistles where the word Gospel is used, and you will see that 'preaching the Gospel' meant telling the story of the life and death and resurrection of our Lord. It follows then (without taking into account the fact that many of our Lord's sayings would not have been intelligible without an explanation of the circumstances under which they were spoken) that we cannot reasonably believe that those who preserved a record of our Lord's words did not also relate something of His acts. In point of fact, our three Synoptic Gospels contain a common element, which includes deeds as well as words of Christ; and the only satisfactory account of this common element is, that it represents an apostolic tradition used by all three.

Later on I shall have to say a little as to the theories that have been framed to explain the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels: theories which propose to account as well for their substantial agreement as for their variations in detail. At present I am concerned with the coincidences between the three narratives which are altogether too numerous to be referred to chance. They agree in the main in their selection of facts—all travelling over nearly the same ground; though independent narrators would be sure to have differed a good deal in their choice of subjects for narration out of a public life of three years. In point of fact we do find exactly such a difference between the life of our Lord as related by St. John and by the Synoptics. These last agree in the main in the order of their narrative; and in many cases they tell the story in almost identical words. If these coincidences of language only occurred in the report of our Lord's discourses, they would not afford much ground for remark; though even in that case, before we could assert the perfect independence of the reporters, we should have to inquire in what language our Lord spoke. If He spoke in Aramaic, different independent translators of His words into Greek would not be likely to coincide not only in words* but in grammatical constructions.

* As an example how likely independent translators are to differ in their choice of words, compare the following two translations given in the Authorized Version for the same Greek words: 'The scribes which *love*

If we were to consider nothing more than the fact that in Aramaic there are but two tenses, and in Greek a great many, we see that the translator into Greek of an Aramaic sentence, even if he were left no choice as to the words he was to employ, would still have great liberty of choice as to the grammatical structure of his sentence. But although the greater number of coincidences naturally occur in the report of our Lord's discourses, which every narrator would be anxious to repeat in the very words in which they had been delivered to him; yet there are, besides, so many cases where, in the relation of incidents, the same words are employed by different Evangelists, that it would be a defiance of all probability to ascribe these coincidences to chance.* Yet, with all these agreements, there is so much diversity, as to suggest the idea to orthodox and sceptical critics alike, that we have here recastings by three later hands of one original Gospel. The difference is just this, that while the orthodox critic makes the original Gospel proceed from apostolic lips or pen, and ascribes the recastings, if we may call them so, to men who were in immediate contact with the Apostles; sceptical critics place their original Gospel at about the same date that we assign to the present form of the Gospel; while to the latter they assign, with one consent, a date later than Papias; and many of them, owing to a blunder, of which I have already told you, place the death of Papias as late as A.D. 165.

I have already argued that the external tradition as to the authorship of a book, if well confirmed, is entitled to much respect, and is not liable to be displaced unless confuted by internal evidence. Now, the mere fact that criticism can discover in the Gospels traces of a still older original is no

---

to *go* in long *clothing*, and love *salutations* in the *market places* and the *chief seats* in the Synagogues, and the *uppermost* rooms at feasts, which for a *pretence* make long prayers.'—St. Mark xii. 38. 'The scribes which *desire* to *walk* in long *robes*, and love *greetings* in the *markets*, and the *highest* seats in the Synagogues, and the *chief* rooms at feasts: which for a *shew* make long prayers.'—St. Luke xx. 46.

* Here are two examples: 'His hand was restored,' ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ (Mark iii. 5; Luke vi. 10: Matt. xii. 13); 'Let it out to husbandmen and went into a far country.' ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν (Matt. xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1; Luke xx. 9).

proof whatever that they are not of the antiquity that has been claimed for them. Give them that date, and there still remains room for an earlier original; while I hope to show you that there is not room for any later recasting. But I must first remark that the concessions which the later school of sceptical critics has been forced to make have evacuated the whole field in which critical science has a right to assert itself against tradition. We can well believe that there would be considerable differences between a document written in A.D. 60 and in 160; and, therefore, if the question were between two such dates, one who judged only by internal evidence might be justified in maintaining his opinion in opposition to external evidence. But now that all sober criticism has abandoned the extravagantly late dates which at one time were assigned to the Gospels, the difference between the contending parties becomes so small, that mere criticism cannot without affectation pretend to be competent to give a decision. Take, for example, the difference between an orthodox critic, who is willing to believe that the fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John in extreme old age, towards the end of the first century, and a sceptical critic of the moderate school, who is willing to allow it to have been written early in the second century. It seems to me that this difference is smaller than criticism can reasonably pronounce upon. For I count it unreasonable to say that it is credible a book should have been written eighty years after our Lord's death, and incredible it should have been written only sixty; when we have scarcely any documentary evidence as to the history of the Church, or the progress of Christian thought during the interval. So I think that the gradual approaches which Baur's successors have been making to the traditional theory indicate that criticism will in the end find itself forced to acquiesce in the account of the origin of the Gospels which the Church has always received.

Let us examine, then, the Church account of the origin of the Gospels, and see whether there is anything in it which what we know of the history of the period gives us a right to pronounce improbable. Although there is no evidence that the existing Gospels have suffered material change since

their first composition, or that our present Matthew and Mark differ from the original Matthew and Mark, of whom German writers speak so much; yet it is not asserted that these Gospels of ours had no predecessors. St. Luke tells us that he was not the first to write a Gospel; nay, that many before him had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of the things most certainly believed among Christians. What, then, has become of these predecessors of our Gospels? How is it that they have so utterly vanished out of existence?

That there are extant apocryphal Gospels you have doubtless heard. In another lecture I hope to give some account of them. Suffice it now to say, that none of them is imagined by critics of any school to be earlier than our four, because the shortest inspection of them shows that they presuppose and acknowledge the Canonical. Accordingly, when Tischendorf maintained that the present apocryphal Gospel of St. James was known to Justin Martyr, and that the Gospel of Nicodemus represents the Acts of Pilate, probably current in the second century, such a theory was loudly protested against by sceptical critics, because these documents presuppose respectively the Gospels of Matthew and John, which, therefore, must have been much earlier. The choice of subjects in the apocryphal Gospels is enough to show that they did not proceed from independent tradition. It is a conceivable thing that since our Lord, after He had become famous, had crowds of hearers about Him, others besides the Apostles might commit to writing their recollections of His words and deeds: so that if the apocryphal Gospels had purported to give an account of our Lord's public ministry, it might at least deserve an examination whether they do not perchance contain some genuine traditions. But that they proceeded from invention, not from tradition, is shown by the fact that they are silent on those parts of our Lord's life about which traditions might be expected to exist. They rather undertake to fill up the gaps of the Gospel history, to tell us the history of Joseph and Mary previous to their marriage, or the events of the Saviour's infancy or childhood. No doubt, Christians would naturally be curious for information about

these topics, and, finding the Gospels silent, might be prepared to welcome some answer to their questions from anyone who professed to be able to give it. But nothing is more intrinsically improbable than that anyone should possess trustworthy information on such points as these who could add nothing to the Gospel history of the deeds and words of our Saviour after He became a public teacher.

Acknowledging, then, that no Gospel earlier than the Canonical is now extant, we have to ask, Did the Church formally select our four from the mass of evangelical tradition; and was it in consequence of the pre-eminence given to these by the force of authority that the others then disappeared? Not so: it is a remarkable fact that we have no early interference of Church authority in the making of a Canon; no Council discussed this subject; no formal decisions were made. The Canon seems to have shaped itself; and if, when we come further on, you are disposed to complain of this because of the vagueness of the testimony of antiquity to one or two disputed books, let us remember that this non-interference of authority is a valuable topic of evidence to the genuineness of our Gospels; for it thus appears that it was owing to no adventitious authority, but by their own weight, that they crushed all rivals out of existence. Whence could they have had this weight except from its being known that the framers of these Gospels were men of superior authority to the others, or with access to fuller information?

Accept Luke's account of the matter as given in the preface to his Gospel and in the Acts, and all is plain. He tells us at the beginning of the Acts that the qualification necessary in one to be added to the apostolic body was, that he should have companied with the Apostles all the time that our Lord went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John until the day that He was taken up. And although it is stated that the specific object of this was in order that the person chosen might give witness of the Resurrection; yet the qualification itself implies that it was the special function of an Apostle to bear witness to the whole public life of our Lord, from His baptism to His ascension. Even if it had

not been the official duty of an Apostle to bear this testimony, who can suppose that the eager curiosity of Christians for authentic information concerning the early life of Him, on whom their whole faith was built, could leave unquestioned the men who had been His intimate companions;—men, moreover, who had the promise of His Spirit to bring to their recollection the things that Jesus had said to them? It could not be, therefore, but that each Apostle would be frequently called on to repeat the story of the things which Jesus had said or done. Nothing would be more probable than that, on repetition he should tell the story nearly in the same way. Yet we cannot well suppose that the Apostle would at first give one continuous narrative, intended to embrace all that Jesus had said or done. He would be more likely, as Papias tells in the case of St. Peter, to give the accounts of separate incidents, as the wants of his hearers made it expedient that this or that history should be related. Now, nothing would be more probable also, than that those who heard these sacred narratives, and desired, as every Christian would, to preserve the memory of them, should write down what they had heard; and the next step would be to frame such detached accounts into an orderly narrative. This is what I understand from Luke's Preface, that before him many had taken in hand to do;—not to write from their own resources a life of Christ, but merely to arrange into an orderly story (*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν*) the things which had been orally delivered to them by those who were from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word. And this, which they had undertaken to do, Luke, who claims to be possessor of more complete and accurate knowledge, also undertakes to do (*γράψαι καθεξῆς*), that so Theophilus might have certain knowledge of the things in which he had been instructed.

It is easy to conceive that when Luke had performed his task, his work was recognized as so much more full, and so much more trustworthy than most previous arrangements of the apostolic traditions, that no one tried to preserve these abortive attempts. Similarly, if Matthew's Gospel and Mark's were written by the persons to whom we ascribe them, we can

understand how they at once superseded attempts to supply the same want made by men of less estimation in the Church. But all the facts lead us to the conclusion that these Gospels, which have absorbed all other attempts to commit our Lord's teaching to writing, must have been of so early a date, that no previous Gospel had had time to gain an established reputation, and that they must have been written by men holding in the Church some position of distinction.

We may draw what I think is a strong proof of the antiquity of our Gospels from the absence of all authentic tradition as to the manner of their first publication. Such tradition would be very welcome if it could be had, and might help us to a solution of several difficulties. For instance, there are verses wanting from some early manuscripts of the Gospels which internal evidence strongly disposes us to pronounce genuine, and yet which we find it hard to conceive that any transcriber would leave out, who found them in the text he had to copy. So the idea suggests itself, Is it not possible that the Evangelist may have published more than one edition of his Gospel, so that each of the types of manuscript represents a genuine text; the shorter representing the first edition of the Gospel, the fuller representing the text as subsequently completed by genuine additions made by the Evangelist himself? But no tradition is early enough to throw any light on such a hypothesis, either in the way of confirmation or refutation. At the latter part of the second century, which is the first date from which Christian writings in any abundance have been preserved to us, it is evident no more was known on the subject than is known now. The publication of the Gospels dated from a time of then immemorial antiquity. There sprang up a belief that Matthew had published his Gospel in Palestine, Mark in Italy, Luke in Greece; and at a later period, John in Asia-Minor, by way of supplement to the previous histories. It is by no means incredible that the fact that we have three versions of our Lord's life, with so much in common, may have arisen from independent publication at different places at nearly the same time; but any tradition on the subject is too late for us to build much on it. If any traditions deserve respect they are those of Papias.

who made it his business to collect them, and who was comparatively early in date ; but even Papias is too late to give us much help in solving the difficulties which the question of the origin of the Gospels presents.

In the absence, then, of any contemporary testimony as to the manner of publication of the Gospels, or as to the existence of any form of them different from what we have now, we have tried to examine whether there is anything opposed to probability in what tradition does assert, namely, that the books were written either by Apostles or companions of the Apostles. We have seen that the admission of this authorship still leaves an interval between the first publication of the Gospel story and the existing record, quite long enough to afford room for explaining the phenomena which the actual texts present. The question with which we have now to deal is, Can we reasonably go later? How long could the Christian world manage to do without authoritative Gospels? I answer, Not long after the first outburst of missionary zeal, and the consequent foundation of Churches distant from Jerusalem. Remember what I said just now, that there was a time before the word 'Gospel' denoted the name of a book: the Gospel then signified the subject of the preaching of every Christian missionary, and that was in two words—Jesus Christ. It was because it told the story of Jesus Christ that the Book of Matthew, or John, or Mark, or Luke, came to be called the Gospel. We know from the first detailed account of the Christian weekly meetings for worship—that given by Justin Martyr—that the reading of the story of Jesus Christ was part of the stated business of these meetings. How early are we to date the origin of this practice? We have only our sense of historical probability to guide us. But take these five documents, which Baur does not question—four Epistles of St. Paul, and the Apocalypse—and gather from them what the early Church thought of Jesus Christ, and I feel you will be persuaded that to tell of Him must, from the first, have been the business of every Christian preacher. If a Church were presided over by Apostles or others who had first-hand knowledge of the facts, such presidents would be able to tell all that was necessary from their personal recollections, un-

assisted by any written record. But what would happen when the apostolic preachers who had founded a new Church went away? The first expedient, no doubt, would be to leave in charge of it a disciple who had been thoroughly trained and catechized, and so might be trusted to give the people the lessons of which they had need. But with the multiplication of Churches it would become more and more difficult to find persons possessing that long familiarity with the facts which would qualify them for this task.

It is indeed a point in which modern missions contrast with apostolic missions, that in our day the formation of a native ministry is of slow growth, and in most places where congregations have been gathered from the heathen, the majority of the teachers are furnished by the Church which sent forth the first missionaries. But in the apostolic days, soon after the first burst of missionary effort, and the preaching of the Gospel in foreign cities, we read of the Apostles ordaining Elders in every city How were these new Elders to be supplied with the knowledge their office required? The obvious remedy would be, that men who knew the story well should commit it to writing for the benefit of a new generation of teachers. Have we any cause to pronounce it unlikely that such a remedy should be adopted? We are not speaking of a pre-historic age like that of the composition of the Homeric poems, in the case of which it may be deemed more probable that ballads should pass on from mouth to mouth, than that they should be preserved by the then unknown or unfamiliar art of writing. We have to do with a literary age. If we want to know what amount of literary culture was possessed by the first Christian Churches, we have, in Paul's unquestioned Epistles, specimens of the communications that passed between a Christian missionary and his converts. Can anyone read these letters and doubt that the first Christian teachers included men quite competent to commit their message to writing, and that the communities which they founded included men capable of appreciating and being grateful for such a service? If Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote their Gospels at the time tradition says they did, they only met a demand which must have been then pressing, and

which, if they had not then satisfied it, somebody else must have attempted to supply.

Well, if we find reason to hold that Gospels were written by Apostles or their companions, is it consistent with probability to believe that they were subsequently changed from their original form? I have told you of Renan's explanation of the original of the Gospels in the little books in which different simple Christians wrote down such stories as they had come across concerning the Saviour's life and teaching. To me it is the most amazing thing in the world that a man should write seven volumes about the Origins of Christianity, and not have become cognizant of the existence of the Christian Church. One of the most patent facts in the history of our religion is its organization: wherever there were Christians they formed a community; wherever a Church was founded it was provided with duly commissioned teachers. It was not the business of the individual Christian to compile a Gospel for himself; he was duly instructed in it by the recognized heads of the Christian community to which he belonged. I do not pretend that there was any decision of the universal Church on the subject. I well believe that the adoption of a definite form of evangelic instruction was regulated for each Church by its bishop, if you will permit me to call him so; or if any difficulty is raised as to the use of this word, I will say, by its presiding authority. But, on any view of this authority, its extension renders it incredible that the Gospels originated in the haphazard way which Renan describes.

When the choice of which I speak was once made, was it liable to be easily changed? I have spoken already of the blunder in historical inquiries of projecting our own feelings into the minds of men of former generations. This is what we are accused of doing here. We have been brought up from childhood to believe in the inspiration of these sacred narratives; wilfully to change a word of them seems to us sacrilege. But, it is said, we have no right to attribute any such feeling to the first disciples, whose sole anxiety was to know as much as possible of what Jesus had said or done, and to whom it would be a matter of comparative indifference

whether or not they had the exact form in which Mark or Luke had recorded it. But people would at least be solicitous about the historic certainty of the things to which they were to give their faith. St. Luke tells his disciple his object in writing was ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. Without such ἀσφάλεια the Christian people could not be satisfied. Theophilus of Antioch, writing about A.D. 180, says: 'Writers ought either to have been eyewitnesses themselves of the things they assert, or at least have accurately learned them from those who had seen them. For those who write uncertain things do nothing but beat the air.' The feeling here expressed is so natural that I cannot believe that those who were in possession of narratives, supposed to have been written by men of such rank in the Church as Matthew, Mark, and Luke, could allow them to be altered by inferior authority. Little do those who suppose such an alteration possible know of the conservatism of Christian hearers. St. Augustine, in a well-known story, tells us that, when a bishop, reading the chapter about Jonah's gourd, ventured to substitute St. Jerome's 'hedera' for the established 'cucurbita,' such a tumult was raised, that if the bishop had persevered he would have been left without a congregation.* The feeling that resents such change is due to no later growth of Christian opinion. Try the experiment on any child of your acquaintance. Tell him a story that interests him; and when you next meet him tell him the story again, making variations in your recital, and see whether he will not detect the change, and be indignant at it. I do not believe, in short, that any Church would permit a change to be made in the form of evangelic instruction in which its members had been catechetically trained unless those who made the change were men of authority equal to their first instructors. Take the age in which the Apostles and apostolic men were going about as teachers; and with regard to that age I can believe in recastings and divers versions of the evangelic narrative, all commended to the Christian world by equal authority. But if a bishop of the age of Papias had presumed to inno-

* Augustine, *Ep.* 71, vol. ii., pp. 161, 179.

vate on the Gospel as it had been delivered by those 'which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word,' I venture to say that, like the bishop of whom Augustine tells, he would have been left without a congregation.

IX.

PART II.

THEORIES AS TO THEIR ORIGIN.

HAVING at some length laid before you the account which Church tradition gives of the origin of our Gospels, I went on in the last lecture to compare with this the conclusions to which we are led by a study of these writings themselves; and I did not then proceed further than was necessary to show that these conclusions are in no wise contradictory to the traditional account, but rather are confirmatory of it. But the study of the genesis of the Gospels has much more than an apologetic interest. Critics of all schools have been tempted to grapple with the perplexing problems presented by the aspect of three narratives of the same series of events, so like each other, not only in arrangement, but in verbal details, as to convince us that there must be a close affinity of some kind between them, and yet presenting manifold diversities, such as to be irreconcilable with the most obvious ways of accounting for the resemblances.

It is not without some reluctance that I go on to describe to you more minutely the problems that have to be solved, and to tell you something of the attempts made to solve them. Not that I share the feelings of some who regard their belief in the inspiration of the Gospels as precluding any such inquiry. They cannot imagine that one inspired by the Holy Spirit should have need to consult any previous document, and they think it enough to hold that such as the Gospels are now, such their Divine Author from the first ordained they should be. Some such feeling stood for a time in the way of

geological inquiries. If the markings of a stone resembled a plant or a fish, it was held that this was but a sport of Creative Power, which had from the beginning made the fossil such as we see it. Yet we now feel that we may lawfully study the indications of their origin which God's works present, in the reverent belief that He has not mocked us with delusive suggestions of a fictitious history. Similarly we may pronounce it to be not truly reverent to decline a careful study of God's Word on account of any preconceived theory as to the mode of composition most befitting an inspired writer.

My reluctance to enter with you upon this inquiry arises solely from my sense of its extreme difficulty. As I have already said, we are on ground where we have no authentic history to guide us; for the earliest uninspired Church writers are far too late to have had personal knowledge of the publication of the Gospels, and such traditions as they have preserved are extremely scanty, and not always to be implicitly relied on. And the history of the present speculations shows how difficult it is to plant firm footsteps where we are obliged to depend on mere criticism, unaided by historical testimony. For if I wished to deter you from forming any theory as the origin of the Gospels, and to persuade you that knowledge on this subject is now unattainable by man, I should only have to make a list for you of the discordant results arrived at by a number of able and ingenious men who have given much study to the subject.

Yet patient and careful thought has so often gained unexpected victories, that we incur the reproach of indolent cowardice if we too easily abandon problems as insoluble. In particular, we ought not to grudge our labour when it is on God's Word we are asked to bestow our study. It is scarcely creditable to Christians that in recent years far more pains have been expended on the minute study of the New Testament writings by those who recognized in them no Divine element, than by those who believe in their inspiration. In fact, their very belief in inspiration, fixing the thoughts of Christians on the Divine Author of the Bible, made them indifferent or even averse to a comparative examination of the work of the respective human authors of the

sacred books. They were sure there could be no contradiction between them, and it was all one to their faith in what part of the Bible a statement was made, so that no practical object seemed to be gained by inquiring whether or not what was said by Matthew was said also by Mark. In modern times the study of the New Testament has been taken up by critics who, far from shutting their eyes to discrepancies, are eager to magnify into a contradiction the smallest indication they can discover of opposite 'tendencies' in the different books; and we must at least acknowledge the closeness and carefulness of their reading, and be willing in that respect to profit by their example. For these reasons, notwithstanding the discouraging absence of agreement among the critics who have tried from a study of the Gospels themselves to deduce the history of their origin, I think myself bound to lay before you some account of their speculations.

The hypotheses which have been used to account for the close agreement of the Synoptic Evangelists in so much common matter are three-fold:—(1) The Evangelists copied, one from another; the work of him whom we may place first having been known to the second, and these two to the third. (2) The Evangelists made use of one or more written documents which have now perished. (3) The common source was not written but oral, the very words in which Apostles had first told the story of the Saviour's works having been faithfully preserved by the memory of different disciples. There is wide room for differences among themselves in details between the advocates of each of these three solutions; and the solutions also may be variously combined, for they do not exclude one another. If the first of the three Synoptics, whichever he was, made use of a previous document, it is conceivable that the second Evangelist may have not only made use of the first Gospel, but also of that previous document; while, again, if we assert that an Evangelist used written documents, we are still not in a position to deny that some of the things he records had been communicated to him orally. Evidently, therefore, there is room for a great variety of rival hypotheses.

Before I enter on any detailed discussion of them there is a preliminary caution which it is by no means unnecessary

to give, viz. that in our choice of a solution we ought to be determined solely by a patient comparison of each hypothesis with the facts; and that we are not entitled to decide off-hand on any solution according to the measure of its agreement with our preconceived theory of inspiration. For example, there are some who think that they are entitled to reject without examination both the first and the second of the solutions I have stated, because they cannot believe that if the story of our Lord's life had been once written down by an inspired hand, any subsequent writer who knew of it would permit himself to vary from it in the slightest degree; while they do not find the same difficulty in conceiving that variations may have been introduced into the narrative in the process of oral transmission before it was written down.* For myself, I see no *a priori* reason for preferring one account of the matter to the other. If we had had to speculate beforehand on the way in which it was likely God would have provided an inspired record of the life of His Son upon this earth, we should not have guessed that there would be four different narratives presenting certain variations among themselves. But we know, as a matter of fact, that He has not seen fit to secure uniformity of statement between the sacred writers. I need not delay to give reasons for thinking that the Bible, such as we have it, is better adapted for the work it was to accomplish than if it had been endowed with attributes which men might think would add to its perfection. I content myself with the matter of fact that God has permitted that there should be variations between the Gospels; and if He did not choose to prevent them by miraculously guarding the memory of those who reported the narratives before they were written down, I know no greater reason for His interfering miracu-

* Thus Mr. Sadler, a writer for whom I have much respect, says (Comm. on St. Matthew, p. xi): 'St. Luke, if he had either of the two first [Gospels] before him, would have scarcely reproduced so much that is common to both, with alterations also which he could never have made if he looked upon them as inspired documents.' And again, 'The inspiration [of the Gospels] is incompatible with the theory that they were all taken from one document, for in such a case that unknown and lost document must have been the only one which could be called the work of the Spirit; and the alterations which each one made in it, which their mutual discrepancies show, prove that in altering it they individually were not so far guided by the Holy Spirit.'

lously for a similar purpose on the supposition that the Evangelists used written documents.

Needless embarrassment, in fact, has been caused by theories invented under a fancied necessity of establishing that conditions have been satisfied in the transmission of the Divine message, which cannot be shown to be essential to what one of the Evangelists declares to have been his object in writing, viz. 'That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through His name.' We do not imagine that when two of the apostolic missionaries went about preaching the Gospel they would think themselves bound to tell the story of the Saviour's life exactly in the same way, nor even that if one were relating an incident at which he had not been present himself, he would think it necessary to repeat the identical words of his informant. If God did not see fit to provide statements of rigid uniformity for the establishment of the faith of the first generation of Christians, whose souls were, no doubt, as dear to Him as those of their successors, what warrant have we for asserting that He must have dealt differently with later generations? When anyone imagines himself entitled to pronounce off-hand that the second Evangelist (whichever he was) could not have known that an inspired writer had performed the task before him, we cannot but ask him if he does not believe that the second Evangelist was inspired as much as the first. Whether the human author of the second Gospel knew or not that he had had a predecessor, the Divine Author of the work assuredly knew; and, notwithstanding, it was His will that the second Gospel should be written. The fact that the two Evangelists stood precisely on a level, in respect of supernatural assistance, makes all the difference in the world to the argument. *We* justly assign to the four Gospels a place apart. Though many in our day undertake to write Lives of Christ, we know that what they presume to add without warrant from these inspired narratives may freely be rejected. But the apostolic preachers were not dependent on any written Gospel for their knowledge. Every one of our Evangelists has told us many things which he could not have learned from the work of any of the other

three. If one of the apostolic band of missionaries, on quitting a Church which he had founded, desired to leave behind, for the instruction of his converts, a record of the facts on which their faith rested, I know no reason why he should not be free to choose whether he should give to be copied the story as written by another Evangelist, or whether he should commit to writing the narrative as he had been accustomed, in his oral teaching, to deliver it himself. I am sure that we are over-arrogant if we venture to dictate the conditions according to which inspiration must act, and if we undertake to pronounce, from our own sense of the fitness of things, what mode of using his materials would be permissible to one commissioned to write by God's Holy Spirit.

But Alford objects, that if one of our Evangelists knew the work of another, or a document on which it was founded, the arbitrary manner in which he must have used his archetype—at one moment servilely copying its words, and the next moment capriciously deviating from them—is inconsistent not only with a belief in the inspiration of the antecedent document employed, but also with the ascription to it of any authority whatever. I am persuaded that this assertion cannot be maintained by anyone who takes the pains to study the way in which historians habitually use the documents they employ as authorities. The ordinary rule is, that a great deal of the language (including most of the remarkable words) of the original passes into the work of the later writer, who, however, is apt to show his independence by variations, the reasons for which are often not obvious. Mr. Smith, of Jordan Hill, whose work on the Shipwreck of St. Paul I have already recommended to you, wrote also a treatise on the origin of the Gospels. In this he places side by side accounts of battles, as given in Napier's *History of the Peninsular War*, in Alison's *History*, and in a French military memoir employed by both writers; and he finds just the same phenomena as our Gospels exhibit. The three narratives not only agree in their general purport, but have many common words: sometimes a whole sentence is common to two; and yet identity of narration is never kept up long without some interruption.

In ancient times it was considered legitimate to use, without acknowledgment, the very words of a preceding writer to a much greater extent than would now be regarded as consistent with literary honesty. But even when one means to copy the exact words of another, it is very easy to deviate from perfect accuracy. It might be amusing, but would lead me too far from my subject, if I were to give you illustrations how little we can be sure that what modern writers print with inverted commas does really contain the *ipsissima verba* of the writer whom they profess to quote. Of ancient writers, there is none whose reputation for accuracy stands higher than that of Thucydides: yet, what he gives (v. 47) as the accurate copy of a treaty presents no fewer than thirty-one variations from the portions of the actual text recently recovered.* The frequent occurrence of variations in what are intended to be faithful transcripts arises from the fact that it is irksome to stop the work of the pen in order to refer to the archetype, and so the copyist is under a constant temptation to try to carry more in his head than his memory can faithfully retain. Naturally, then, when a writer undertakes no obligation of faithful transcription, but of his own free will uses the words of another, he will look at his archetype at longer intervals—not referring to it as long as he believes that he sufficiently remembers the sense; and consequently, while he reproduces the more remarkable words which have fixed themselves in his memory, will be apt to vary in what may seem a capricious way from his original. I do not think that the variations between the Synoptic Gospels exceed in number or amount what might be expected to occur in the case of three writers using a common authority; nor do I think that we have any right to assume that God would miraculously interfere to prevent the occurrence of such variations.

If we desire to know what amount of variation an Evangelist might probably think it needless to exclude, some means of judgment are afforded by the three accounts of the conversion of St. Paul contained in the Acts of the Apostles. These accounts present the same phenomena of great resemblance

* Mahaffy's *History of Greek Literature*, ii. 121.

with unaccountable diversities, and even apparent contradictions. If they had been found in different works it might have been contended that the author of one had not seen the others; and ingenious critics might have even discovered the different 'tendencies' of the narrators. As things are, we seem to have in the comparison of these narratives a measure of the amount of variation which St. Luke regarded as compatible with substantial accuracy. I am therefore unable to assent to those who would set aside without examination the hypothesis that one Evangelist was indebted to another, or that both had used a common document; and who would reduce us to an oral tradition as the only source of their agreements that can be asserted without casting an imputation on the inspiration or on the authority of our existing documents.

Yet, after all, we have advanced but a little way when we have vindicated for the advocates for the documentary hypothesis* the right to get a hearing. We may now go on to examine what need there is of any such hypothesis. The oral teaching of the Apostles was, no doubt, the common basis of all the Evangelic narratives. Does this common basis sufficiently account for all the facts?

Let us then observe the precise nature of the agreement between the Synoptic narratives. If the story of a miracle were told by two independent witnesses we should have relations in substantial agreement no doubt, but likely to differ considerably in their form. But in a number of cases the Synoptic narratives agree so closely, in form as well as in substance, as to convince us that they are not stories told by independent witnesses, but different versions of the story some one witness had told. Take, for example, a verse common to all three Synoptics (Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24): 'But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.'

* 'Hypothesis,' perhaps, is hardly a right word to use. We know as a certain fact, from St. Luke's preface, that other documents were in existence when he wrote. It is then scarcely an hypothesis to assume that he made use of these documents, however much his superior knowledge enabled him to supplement or correct them.

You will feel that it would be scarcely possible for three independent narrators to agree in interpolating this parenthesis into their report of our Lord's words. Take another example: St. Luke (viii. 28), relating the miracle of the healing of the demoniac, tells that 'when he saw Jesus he cried out, 'What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God most high? I beseech thee, torment me not. For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man.' Now, if the story had been told in the chronological order we should first have Jesus' command to the unclean spirit to depart, and then the remonstrance of the demoniac. So when we find Mark (v. 7) agreeing with Luke in the minute detail of relating the remonstrance first, and then adding parenthetically that there had been a command, this coincidence alone gives us warrant for thinking that we have here, not the story as it might have been told by two different witnesses to the miracle, but the story in the form in which a single witness was accustomed to tell it.

Add now the consideration that both in the instances just produced, and in many others, we have a vast number of verbal coincidences between the corresponding narratives of different Evangelists; and we may go further. Either the story, as it proceeded from the lips of that single witness, was written down; or at least the hearers did not content themselves with a faithful report of the substance of what he related, but must have striven to commit to memory the very words in which he related it. Before the narrative came into our Gospels it had passed out of the fluidity of a story, told now one way, now another, and had crystallized into a definite form.

When we have reached this point, it seems to become practically unimportant to determine whether or not writing had been used for the preservation of the story before it was included in our Gospels. If writing was so used, it would clearly be idle to inquire whether the material to which the writing had been committed was papyrus, or parchment, or waxen tablets. Well, if we are willing to believe that the memory of the first disciples, unspoiled by the habit of writing and stimulated by the surpassing interest of the subject,

retained what was entrusted to it as tenaciously and as faithfully as a written record, then the hypothesis that a story had been preserved by memory stands on the same level as the hypothesis that it had been preserved on papyrus or on parchment. We should have no means of determining, and very little interest in determining, which hypothesis was actually true. In either case we acknowledge that the tradition had assumed the fixity of a written record.

It is because we have not only one but a series of stories common to the Synoptics that the difference between documentary and oral transmission comes to have a practical meaning. The latter supposition contemplates a number of stories preserved independently: the former regards them as already embodied in a document which, even if it did not pretend to be a complete Gospel, contained the narration of more incidents than one, disposed in a definite order. Our choice between the two suppositions can be guided by examining whether the Evangelists agree, not only in their way of relating separate stories, but also in the order in which they arrange them. Now, a careful examination brings out the fact that the likeness between the Synoptic Gospels is not confined to agreement in the way of telling separate stories, but extends also to the order of arranging them. Take, for instance, the agreement between Matthew and Mark as to the place in which they tell the death of John the Baptist (Matt. xiv. 1; Mark vi. 14). They relate that when Herod heard of the fame of Jesus he was perplexed who He might be, and said to his servants, 'This is John whom I beheaded.' And then, in order to explain this speech, the two Evangelists go back in their narrative to relate the beheading of John. Their agreement in this deviation from the natural chronological order can scarcely be explained except by supposing either that one Evangelist copied from the other, or both from a common source. The order of St. Luke deviates here from that of the other two Evangelists. He relates the imprisonment of John in its proper place (iii. 19), and the perplexed inquiry of Herod later (ix. 7); but we are not entitled to infer that he did not employ the same source, for the change is an obvious im-

provement that would suggest itself to anyone desirous to relate the history in chronological order. And we may even conjecture that it was in consequence of Luke's thus departing from the order of his archetype that he has come to omit altogether the direct narrative of the beheading of John.

The example I have cited is not an isolated one. Our attention, indeed, is caught by a few cases in which an incident is differently placed by different Evangelists, but the rule is uniformity of order; and in particular Mark and Luke are in very close agreement. Of course as to a few leading events, the arrangement would admit of no choice. All narratives would begin with the story of our Lord's Birth, would go on to tell of His Baptism, and would finish with His Passion and Resurrection. But there is a host of incidents, the order of arranging which is dictated by no internal necessity. If these had been preserved separately by oral tradition, the chances are enormous that different persons weaving them into a connected narrative would arrange them differently; for the stories themselves but rarely contain notes of time, such as would direct the order of placing them. I feel bound, therefore, to conclude that the likeness between the Gospels is not sufficiently explained by their common basis, the oral narrative of the Apostles; and that they must have copied, either one from the other—the later from the earlier—or else all from some other document earlier than any. Reuss* has divided the Evangelic narrative into 124 sections, of which 47 are common to all three Synoptics; and I believe that in these common sections we have, represented approximately, a primary document used by all three Evangelists. I say approximately, for of course we cannot assume without careful examination that some of these sections may not have come in from a different source, or that some sections

* Professor at Strassburg. The division is given, p. 17 of the introduction to his *Histoire Evangélique*, which forms part of his French translation of the Bible, with commentary. I have found this introduction very instructive, and it would have been more so if Reuss had cleared his mind of the cobwebs that have been spun about the fragments of Papias.

which we now find only in two Evangelists, or even only in one, may not have belonged to the common basis.

On the other hand, a study of the order of narration gives the death-blow to Schleiermacher's theory that the 'Logia' of St. Matthew consisted of a collection of our Lord's discourses. It is not only that the words of Papias, as I have contended, give us no authority for believing in the existence of this 'Spruchsammlung,' which so many critics assume as undoubted fact; but critical comparison of the Gospels gives us reason to assert the negative, and say that no such collection of discourses existed. If the Evangelists took their report of our Lord's sayings from a previously existing document, they would have been likely in their arrangement to follow the order of that document; but if the sayings were separately preserved by the memory of the hearers, two independent arrangers would probably dispose them in different order. Now, the sections common to the three Synoptics contain some discourses of our Lord, and, as a rule, these follow the same order in all; but besides these Matthew and Luke report many other of His sayings, and in the case of these last there is no agreement between the order of the two Evangelists. Take, for example, the Sermon on the Mount, which seems to offer the best chance of complete agreement, there being a corresponding discourse in St. Luke. But the result is, that of the 107 verses in the Sermon on the Mount only 27 appear in the corresponding discourse in Luke vi. Twelve more of these verses are found in the 11th chapter, 14 in the 12th, 3 in the 13th, 1 in the 14th, 3 in the 16th, and 47 are omitted altogether. The same dislocation is found if we compare any other of the discourses in St. Matthew with St. Luke. And if we further take into account how many parables and other sayings of our Lord there are in each of these two Gospels, which are not found in the other, and yet which no one who found them in a document he was using would be likely to omit, we can assert, with as much confidence as we can assert anything on critical grounds alone, and in the absence of external evidence, that Matthew and Luke did not draw from any documentary record containing only our Lord's

discourses, but that the sayings they have in common must have reached them as independent fragments of an oral tradition.

What I have said gives me occasion to remark that theories as to one of the Synoptics having copied another seem to me deserving consideration, only if we confine them to the relations of Mark to the other two, for Matthew and Luke show every sign of being quite independent of each other.* When we compare the accounts which they give of our Lord's birth, we find them proceed on such different lines as to suggest that they have been supplied by independent authorities. The two accounts agree in the main facts that our Lord was miraculously conceived of the Virgin Mary, who was espoused to a man named Joseph, of the lineage of David; that the birth took place at Bethlehem, and that the family afterwards resided at Nazareth. But the two Gospels give different genealogies to connect Joseph with David, and with respect to further details those which the one gives are absent from the other. In the one we have successive revelations to Joseph, the visit of the Magi, the slaughter of the Innocents, the flight into Egypt. In the other the annunciation to Mary, the visit to Elisabeth, the taxing, the visit of the shepherds, the presentation in the temple, and the testimony of Simeon and Anna. As we proceed further in our comparison of the two Gospels, we continue to find a number of things in each which are not recorded in the other; and it is not easy to see why, if one were using the other as an authority, he should omit so many things well suited to his purpose. When, therefore, we have to explain the agreements of these two Evangelists, the hypothesis that one borrowed directly from the other is so immensely less probable than the hypothesis that both writers drew from a common source, that the former hypothesis may safely be left out of consideration.

The hypothesis that the later of the Synoptics borrowed from the earlier may evidently be maintained, and has actu-

* If this be so, no great interval of time can have separated their publications; otherwise the later could scarcely fail to have become acquainted with the work of the earlier.

ally been maintained in six different forms, according as they are supposed to have written in the orders: Matthew, Mark, Luke; Matthew, Luke, Mark; Mark, Matthew, Luke; Mark, Luke, Matthew; Luke, Matthew, Mark; Luke, Mark, Matthew. You will find in Meyer's *Commentary* (or, perhaps, more conveniently in that of Alford, who has copied Meyer's list) the names of the advocates of each of these arrangements. However, if we regard it as established that Matthew and Luke were independent, it is only with regard to the relations of these two to Mark that the hypothesis that one Evangelist used the work of another need come under consideration. Some maintain that Mark's Gospel was the earliest, and that Matthew and Luke independently incorporated portions of his narrative with additions of their own: others believe that Mark wrote latest, and that he combined and abridged the two earlier narratives.* To this question I mean to return.

The theory that one Evangelist copied the work of another is sometimes modified by the supposition that the Gospel copied was not one of those we read now, but the supposed original Matthew or original Mark, from which it is imagined that our existing Gospels were developed. I count this as but a form of the solution which will next come under consideration, viz. that the Evangelists used common documents. To give to one of these documents the question-begging name of 'original Matthew,' &c., is to overload the hypothesis with an assumption which it is impossible to verify. Such a name implies not only that the compiler of that which we now call St. Matthew's Gospel used previous documents, but that he

* This controversy illustrates a source of difficulty in these critical inquiries, viz.: that there is scarcely anything which may not be taken up by one or other of two handles, it constantly happening that the same facts are appealed to by critics who draw from them quite opposite conclusions. For example, certain miracles recorded by St. Mark (i. 32) are related to have been performed 'at even when the sun did set' (ὀψίας γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος). Here St. Matthew (viii. 16) has 'at even' (ὀψίας γενομένης); St. Luke (iv. 40), 'when the sun was setting' (δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου). One critic argues that this comparison clearly shows Mark to be the earliest, his two successors having each omitted part of his fuller statement. Another critic pronounces this to be a clear case of 'conflation,' the latest writer evidently being Mark, who carefully combined in his narrative everything that he found in the earlier sources.

used some one document in a pre-eminent degree, taking it as the basis of his work; and further, that the name of the compiler of the present document was not Matthew, and that this was the name of the author of the basis-document. It is unscientific so to encumber with details the solution of a problem which, in its simplest form, presents quite enough of difficulty. Accumulation of unverifiable details is a manifest note of spuriousness. We should, for instance, be thankful to anyone who could tell us in what year Papias or Justin Martyr was born; but if our informant went on to tell us the day of the month and hour of the day, we should know at once that we had to do with romance, not with history. Quite in like manner we feel safe in rejecting such a history as Scholten has given of the origin of St. Mark's Gospel. He tells how, from the proto-Marcus combined with the collection of speeches contained in the proto-Matthæus, there resulted the deutero-Matthæus; how this was in time improved into a trito-Matthæus, and, finally, this employed by a new editor of the proto-Marcus to manufacture by its means the deutero-Marcus which we have now. A story so circumstantial and so baseless has no interest for the historical inquirer.

The advocates of the documentary hypothesis have also been apt to encumber their theories with details which pass out of the province of history into that of romance, as they undertake to number and name the different documents which have been used in the composition of the Gospels. Anyone who assumes that our Evangelists used a common document has first to settle the question, In what language are we to suppose that document to have been written: Greek or Hebrew? where, of course, the latter word means not the classical Hebrew of the Old Testament, but the modern type of the language, Aramaic, to which the name Hebrew is given in the New Testament, and which we know was extensively used in Palestine in our Lord's time. It was employed for literary purposes: Josephus, for instance, tells us in his preface that his work on the Jewish wars had been originally written in that language. It is intrinsically probable that the Hebrew-speaking Christians of Palestine should have a Gospel in their own language, and we actually hear of Hebrew

Gospels claiming great antiquity. It is therefore no great stretch of assumption to suppose that a Hebrew Gospel was the first to be written, and that this was made use of by the writers of Greek Gospels.

The hypothesis of a Hebrew original at once accounts for a number of verbal differences between corresponding passages in different Gospels. How easy it is for the process of translation to introduce variations not to be found in the original may be abundantly illustrated from the Authorized Version,* the translators of which declare in their preface that they deliberately adopted the principle of not thinking themselves bound always to translate the same Greek word by the same English. For example, there is considerable verbal difference between the two following texts: 'John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locusts and wild honey' (Matt. iii. 4); 'John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins, and he did eat locusts and wild honey' (Mark i. 6). Yet the sense is so precisely the same that the variations would be completely accounted for, if we suppose the two to be independent translations of the same original in another language. We know for certain that the most important difference between the two texts can be thus accounted for; the 'girdle of a skin' in one Evangelist and the 'leathern girdle' of the other being both translations of the same Greek words, *ζώνην δερματίνην*. It is, then, a very tempting conjecture that the further differences, 'had his raiment of camel's hair,' 'was clothed with camel's hair;' 'his meat was locusts and wild honey,' 'he did eat locusts and wild honey'—differences which exist in the Greek as well as in our version—might be explained by regarding the two Greek accounts as translations from a common Aramaic original. This supposition evidently gives a satisfactory explanation of all variations between the Gospels which are confined to words and do not affect the sense. Some ingenious critics have gone further, and tried to show how some of the variations which do affect the sense might have arisen

* See note, pp. 116, 117.

in the process of translation from an Aramaic original. But I do not feel confidence enough in any of these explanations to think it worth while to report them to you.

Even when the sense is unaffected, the idea may be pushed too far, and we may easily mistake for translational variations what are really editorial corrections. For example, in Matthew (ix. 12) and Mark (ii. 17) we read, 'They that are strong (οἱ ἰσχύοντες) have no need of a physician;' in Luke (v. 31) it is 'they that are well' (οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες). Now Matthew and Luke may have independently translated the same Aramaic word by different Greek ones; but it is also a possible supposition that, having Matthew's or Mark's Greek before him, but knowing that our Lord had not spoken in Greek, Luke purposely altered the popular phrase οἱ ἰσχύοντες into the more correct word to denote health, ὑγιαίνοντες.* Again, St. Mark uses several words which we know, from the grammarian Phrynichus, were regarded as vulgarisms by those who aimed at elegance of Attic style. Such are ἐσχάτως ἔχει (v. 23), εὐσχήμων (xv. 43), κολλυβισταί (xi. 15), κοράσιον (v. 41), κράββατος (ii. 4), μονόφθαλμος (ix. 47), ὁρκίζω (v. 7), ῥάπισμα (xiv. 65), ῥαφίς (x. 25).† Now when Luke avoids all these words, we cannot infer with any certainty that he is merely making an independent translation of an Aramaic original.

---

* Similarly, Luke v. 18 has παραλελυμένος, not παραλυτικός, Mark ii. 3; ἰᾶσθαι (vi. 19), not διασώζειν (Matt. xiv. 36); τρῆμα βελόνης (xviii. 25). not τρύπημα ῥαφίδος (Matt. xix. 24), or τρυμαλιὰ ῥαφίδος (Mark x. 25). Many more instances of the kind will be found in Dr. Hobart's interesting book on *The Medical Language of St. Luke*. In this work the Church tradition that the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles was the same person (viz. he who is described [Col. iv. 14] as Luke the beloved physician) is confirmed by a comparison of the language of these books with that of Greek medical treatises. The result is to show that a common feature of the Third Gospel and the Acts is the use of technical medical terms, which in the New Testament are either peculiar to St. Luke, or at least are used by him far more frequently than by any other of the writers. Dr. Hobart sometimes pushes his argument too far, forgetting that medical writers must employ ordinary as well as technical language, and therefore that every word frequently found in medical books cannot fairly be claimed as a term in which medical writers can be supposed to have an exclusive property. But when every doubtful instance has been struck out of Dr. Hobart's lists, enough remain to establish completely what he desires to prove.

† I take this list from Dr. Abbott's article 'Gospels' in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

The case may be, that St. Luke, having more command of the Greek language than the other Evangelists, designedly altered phrases which he found in a Greek original intended for a circle of readers the majority of whom were not Greek by birth, and who habitually spoke the Greek language with less purity than those for whom his Gospel was composed.

However this may be, the hypothesis of an Aramaic original does not suffice to explain all the phenomena. For there are very many passages where the Evangelists agree in the use of Greek words, which it is not likely could have been hit on independently by different translators. If such cases are to be explained by the use of a common original, that original must have been in the Greek language. On the ἐπιούσιος of the Lord's Prayer, though the word plainly belongs to the class of which I speak, I do not lay stress, because we can well believe that a liturgical use of that Prayer in Greek had become common before our Gospels were written; and such a use would affect the language of translators. Nor again can I lay stress on a very striking and oft-cited specimen: Matt. xxi. 44, ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται, ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν. We have the very same words in St. Luke xx. 18, with only the exception of ἐκεῖνον λίθον for λίθον τοῦτον. It is certainly not likely that two independent translators from the Aramaic should hit on identical expressions. But though the words I have read are found in the text of St. Matthew, as given by an overwhelming majority of Greek MSS., including all the oldest; yet there is a minority, insignificant in numbers, no doubt, but sufficient to establish the fact that a text from which these words were wanting early obtained some circulation. And then we must admit it to be possible that the shorter reading represents the original text of St. Matthew; and the longer, one which a very early transcriber had filled up by an addition from St. Luke. We have no need to insist on any doubtful cases, the instances of the use of common words being so numerous. And in order to feel the force of the argument you need only put in parallel columns the corresponding passages in the different Evangelists: say, of the parable of the Sower or of the answer to the question about fasting (Mark ii. 18–22; Matt. ix. 14–17; Luke

v. 33–39), when you will find such a continuous use of common words as to forbid the idea that we have before us independent translations from another language.*

The use of a common Greek original is further established by a study of the form of the Old Testament quotations in the Gospels. Several such quotations are peculiar to St. Matthew, and are introduced by him with the formula 'that it might be fulfilled.' In these cases the ordinary rule is, that the Evangelist does not take the quotation from the LXX., but translates directly from the Hebrew. It is otherwise in the case of quotations which Matthew has in common with other Evangelists. As a rule they are taken from the LXX., and when they deviate from our text of the LXX. all agree in the deviation. For example, all three quote Malachi's prophecy in the form—*ἰδού, ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου* (Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27). Here the LXX. has *ἰδού, ἐξαποστέλλω τ. ἄ. μ., καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου.* Similarly, Matt. xv. 8, 9, is in verbal agreement with Mark vii. 6, 7, but the quotation is considerably different from the LXX. In Matt. iv. 10; Luke iv. 8, both Evangelists have 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,' while the LXX. have 'Thou shalt fear.'

The result is, that if an Aramaic original document is assumed in order to account for the verbal variations of the Gospels, a Greek original (whether a translation of that Aramaic or otherwise) is found to be equally necessary in order to explain their verbal coincidences.

Again, there are verbal coincidences between St. Matthew and St. Luke in their account of our Lord's temptation and other stories not found in St. Mark. If we account for Mark's omission by the solution that these stories were not contained in the document used by all three Evangelists, we are tempted to imagine a second document used by Matthew and Luke. Thus in hypotheses of this nature documents have a tendency

* See also p. 117. Other examples of common words are—*ἀνάγαιον* (Mark xiv. 15; Luke xxii. 12); *δυσκόλως* (Matt. xix. 23; Mark x. 23; Luke xviii. 24); *κατέκλασε* (Mark vi. 41; Luke ix. 16) *κολοβοῦν* (Matt. xxiv. 22, Mark xiii. 20); *πτερύγιον* (Matt. iv. 5; Luke iv. 9); *διαβλέψεις* (Matt. vii. 5; Luke vi. 42).

to multiply. Eichhorn,* for example, having put forward in 1794 the idea of an Aramaic original from different recensions of which the different Gospels had sprung, Marsh† pointed out the necessity of a Greek original also; and he constructed an elaborate history, how, out of ten different documents, which he distinguished by different Hebrew, Greek, and Roman letters, the Synoptic Gospels severally took their origin. Eichhorn then, in the second edition of his Introduction, adopted Marsh's theory as to its general outline, but added to the number of assumed documents, and otherwise complicated the history. It is not wonderful that these theories found little acceptance with subsequent scholars, who have not been able to believe in so complicated a history, resting on no external evidence, and obtained solely by the inventor's power of critical divination. Nor, indeed, is there much to attract in a theory which almost assumes that in the production of their Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke used no other instrument of composition than paste and scissors.

It may further be remarked that as the number of documents is increased, the documentary theory ceases to differ much from that which makes a common oral tradition the basis of the Gospel narratives. On the latter hypothesis nothing forbids us to suppose that each story when orally delivered may have been separately written down by the hearers, so that the hypothesis is practically equivalent to one which assumes as the basis a large number of independent documents.

I certainly have not courage to follow out the documentary hypothesis into details; but one is strongly tempted to examine whether it does not at least afford the best account of the matter common to the three Synoptics. If you wish

---

* Eichhorn (1752–1827), Professor at Jena and afterwards at Göttingen, published his *Introduction to the New Testament* in successive volumes, first edition, 1804–1812; second edition, 1820–1827.

† Herbert Marsh (1758–1839), Bishop of Peterborough in 1819, having himself studied in Germany, did much to introduce into England a knowledge of German theological speculation. The theory referred to in the text was put forward in 1803 in an Appendix to his translation of Michaelis's *Introduction to the New Testament*.

to pursue this study you can now do so luxuriously by means of Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, published by Macmillan in 1880. The corresponding passages are printed in parallel columns, matter common to the three Synoptics being printed in red, and that common to each two being also distinguished by differences of type. Mr. Rushbrooke's work was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Edwin Abbott, whose article 'Gospels' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* contains a summary of results thus obtained. Dr. Abbott gives in detail the contents of what he calls the 'triple tradition'—that is to say, the matter common to the three Synoptics; then of the three double traditions—that is to say, the matter common to each pair; and, lastly, the addition which each separately has made to the common tradition. Dr. Abbott has accompanied his analysis with many acute remarks, but there are some considerations which it seems to me he has not sufficiently attended to, and which ought to be kept in mind by way of caution by anyone who uses his work.

In the first place, it is obvious that the phrases 'triple tradition,' 'twofold tradition,' express phenomena as they appear to us, not things as they are in themselves. You would feel that a man knew very little of astronomy if he spoke of the full moon, and the half moon, and the new moon, in such a way as to lead one to think that he took these for three distinct heavenly bodies, and not for the same body differently illuminated. Now, considering that the triple tradition becomes a double tradition every time that one of the three writers who transmit it chooses to leave out a word or a sentence, we are bound in our study of the subject constantly to bear in mind the possibility that the triple and the double, and perhaps even the single tradition, may be only the same thing differently illuminated.

The business of science is to interpret phenomena: to deduce from the appearances the facts that underlie them. The work, no doubt, must begin by an accurate study of the phenomena, but it must not stop there. When the painter Northcote was asked with what he mixed his colours, he answered: 'With brains.' The deduction of the original tradition from the existing narratives must be done by

brains; it cannot be done merely by blue and red pencils. The present is not the only case in which it has been attempted to restore a lost document by means of the use made of it by three independent writers.* But was ever critic unintelligent enough to imagine that such a restoration could be effected by the mechanical process of taking out the words common to the three more recent writers? Surely a careful study of the things in which two of the witnesses agree is essential to the investigation; for in such a case it appears, at first sight, a more probable explanation that the third witness here, for some reason, did not care to copy the common document, than that the other two here both deserted it and agreed in drawing their information from a new common source. Moreover, it ought also to be examined whether for the purposes of the investigation the three witnesses are all of equal value, or whether one does not show signs of having adhered closer to his original than the others. For in the latter case a probable claim to belong to the common original might be made on behalf of things reported by that witness, though not confirmed by the other two.†

Now, Dr. Abbott dispenses too summarily with all this brain-work. Having crossed out of his New Testament all the words that are not common to the three Synoptics, he forthwith accepts the residuum as the 'original tradition upon which the Synoptic Gospels are based,' or at least as representing that tradition as nearly as we can now approach to it; and in his work the name 'triple tradition' is constantly used so as to convey the idea of 'original tradition.'‡

---

* I refer in particular to the attempt made by Lipsius in his *Quellenkritik des Epiphanios* to restore a common document used by three writers on heresy—Epiphanius, Philaster, and pseudo-Tertullian.

† Thus there is a general agreement among critics that St. Mark adhered to the common document more closely than the other two Evangelists, and some have even supposed that his Gospel exactly was the common document. I do not believe that it was, but I believe that it represents it infinitely more closely than does Dr. Abbott's 'triple tradition.'

‡ Since the first edition of this lecture was printed, Dr. Abbott, in conjunction with Mr. Rushbrooke, has published what he calls *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels;* and he promises to follow it up with another volume containing the 'Double Tradition,' that is to say,

Thus the triple tradition is said to verify itself, because the sayings of Jesus as they appear in it answer to Justin Martyr's description of being 'short, pithy, and abrupt.' But how could they be otherwise? If the most diffuse orator in the kingdom were treated in the same way, and only those portions of his speeches recognized as genuine, of which three distinct hearers gave a report in identical words, the fragments that survived such a test would assuredly be *βραχεῖς καὶ σύντομοι*, short, and very much cut up.* But Dr. Abbott commits a far more serious mistake, in the tacit assumption he makes in proposing to search for '*the* original tradition upon which the Synoptic Gospels are based.' Admit that the Synoptic Evangelists used a common document, and we are yet not entitled to assume without examination that this contained a complete Gospel, or that it was more than one of the materials they employed. Dr. Abbott treats the triple tradition as if it were not only the original Gospel, but represented it in so complete a form that its omissions might be used to discredit later additions to the story. Thus the 'triple tradition' does not contain the story of our Lord's Resurrection, and of all the miracles ascribed to Him it relates only six.†

---

the portions of the Synoptic narrative common to two Evangelists. This rending the evidence in two seems to me as sensible a proceeding as if a printseller were to cut his stereoscopic slides in two and sell them separately. The double traditions are an essential part of the evidence by which the common original is to be recovered. It must be remembered also that, even if it be granted that the 'triple tradition' and the three 'double traditions' represent four different documents, one at least of the 'double traditions' stands on a level with the 'triple tradition' as respects claims to antiquity. A document antecedent to the two earliest of our Synoptics must be antecedent to all three.

* Here is the narrative of two miracles, as given in the 'triple tradition:'

(1) . . . to the mountain . . walking on the sea . . it is I, be not afraid.

(2) He came into the house . . not dead but sleepeth, and they mocked him. . . Having taken her by the hand . . arise.

† This limitation of number, combined with the casting out of many of the details, facilitates much the application of the methods of Paulus (see p. 10); and the curious reader will find in the Appendix to Dr. Abbott's *Through Nature to Christ* how all six may be explained as being cases where either the spectators of the supposed miracle imagined occurrences to be supernatural, which in truth were not so, or else where the language used by the reporters of the event was misunderstood.

It is certainly worth considering, if we could find the 'original Gospel,' what would be its value as compared with those we have. Suppose, for instance, we could recover one of those earlier Gospels which Luke mentions in his preface, that would certainly be entitled to be called an 'original Gospel.' It was probably defective rather than erroneous; and we may certainly believe that all that was not erroneous has been embodied by St. Luke in his work, so that by a simple process of erasure, if we only knew how to perform it, we might recover all that was valuable in the 'original Gospel.' But would that be an improvement on St. Luke? The Primitive Church did not think so, which allowed the earlier work to drop into oblivion. But could it now be restored, the whirligig of time would bring in its revenges. In the eyes of modern critics every one of its omissions would be a merit. 'It only relates six miracles.' 'What a prize!' 'It does not tell the story of the Resurrection.' 'Why, it is a perfect treasure!'

But before we can build an argument on the omissions of a document, we must know what it aims at doing; and as far as the 'triple tradition' is concerned, quite a new light is cast on the matter when we examine it more closely. We find, then, that it is certainly true that this tradition gives no account of the Resurrection; but then it is also true that it does not contain the history of the Passion: in other words, it was no complete Gospel, but at most the narrative of certain events given by a single relater. Compare the story of the Crucifixion, as told by St. Luke, with that told by St. Matthew and St. Mark, and we find the two accounts completely independent, having scarcely anything in common except what results necessarily from the fact that both are histories of the same event. Again, though with regard to this history, Matthew and Mark are in close agreement, the nature of this agreement is quite different from that which prevails in the earlier narrative. There the two Evangelists present the appearance of using the same source, though in a different way, Matthew reproducing it in an abridged form, Mark with an abundance of pictorial detail. In the history of the Passion, on the contrary, the relation between Matthew

and Mark is constantly one of simple copying. We may conclude then with confidence that if the three Evangelists drew their history from a common source, that source did not extend so far as the relation of the Passion.

There is one remark, obvious enough when it is made, but of which it is quite necessary for you to take notice, viz. that 'triple tradition' does not mean 'triply attested tradition,' but singly attested tradition. If you compare the history of the early Church, as told by three modern historians, you will find several places where they relate a story in nearly identical words. In such a case an intelligent critic would recognize at once that we had, not a story attested by three independent authorities, but one resting on the credit of a single primary authority, coming through different channels. When we come further down in the history, and Eusebius is no longer the unique source of information, exactly as authorities become numerous, verbal agreement between the histories ceases, and our 'triple tradition' comes to an end. Thus, instead of its being true that the 'triple tradition' is the most numerously attested portion of the Gospel narrative, we may conclude that this is just the part for which we have a single primary authority. Now, when the first Christian converts desired to hear the story of their Master's life there would be no difficulty in finding many who could tell them of the Passion and the Resurrection. Everyone who had lived through that eventful week, in which the triumph of Palm Sunday was so rapidly exchanged for the despair of Good Friday, and that, again, for the abiding joy of Easter Sunday, would have all the events indelibly burned on his memory. In comparison with these events, those of the Galilean ministry would retire into the far back distance of things that had occurred years ago; and there would be more than the ordinary difficulty we all experience, when we unexpectedly lose one whom we love, of recalling words which we should have taken pains to treasure in our memory, could we have foreseen we should hear no such words again. I have often thought that the direction to the Apostles to return to Galilee for the interval between the Resurrection and the gift of the Holy Ghost was given in order to provide them with a

season for retirement and recollection, such as they could not have again after they had become the rulers of the newly-formed Church. When we return to the place where we last conversed with a departed friend, as we walk over the ground we trod together, the words he then spoke rise spontaneously to the mind; and nothing forbids us to believe that the Holy Spirit, whose work it was to bring to the disciples' memory the things that Jesus had said, employed the ordinary laws which govern the suggestion of human thoughts. Yet so difficult is it, as I have already observed, to remember with accuracy words spoken at some distance of time, that there would be nothing surprising if the story of the Galilean ministry mainly depended on a single witness, whose recollections were so much the fullest and most accurate that they were accepted and adopted by all.

It seems to me that if it be admitted that the 'triple tradition' rests on the testimony of a single witness, we can go very near determining who that witness was. Take the very commencement of this 'triple tradition.' The whole of the first chapter of St. Mark is occupied with a detailed account of the doings of one day of our Lord's ministry. It was the Sabbath which immediately followed the call of Simon and Andrew, John and James. We are told of our Lord's teaching in the Synagogue, of the healing of the demoniac there, of the entry of the Saviour into Simon's house, the healing of his wife's mother, and then in the evening, when the close of the Sabbath permitted the moving of the sick, the crowd of people about the door seeking to be healed of their diseases. In whose recollections is it likely that that one day would stand out in such prominence? Surely, we may reasonably conjecture that the narrator must have been one of those four to whom the call to follow Jesus had made that day a crisis or turning-point in their lives. The narrator could not well have been John, whose authorship is claimed for a different story; nor could it have been Andrew, who was not present at some other scenes depicted in this 'triple tradition,' such as the Transfiguration and the healing of Jairus's daughter. There remain then but Peter and James the son of Zebedee; and it is again the history of the Transfiguration which deter-

mines our choice in favour of Peter; for to whom else is it likely that we can owe our knowledge of the words he caught himself saying as he was roused from his heavy sleep, though unable, when fully awake, to explain what he had meant by them? It seems to me then that we are quite entitled to substitute, for the phrase 'triple tradition,' 'Petrine tradition;' and to assert that a portion, if not the whole of the matter common to the three Synoptics, is based on what Peter was able to state of his recollections of our Lord's Galilean ministry. Although I have given reasons for thinking that these recollections had been arranged into a continuous narrative before the time of the composition of the Synoptics, we are not bound to believe that this had been done by Peter himself. These recollections would naturally have been made use of by some of those who, as St. Luke tells us, had before him attempted to arrange an orderly narrative of the Saviour's life; and when St. Luke entered on the same work, with more abundant materials and more certain knowledge, he might still have followed the order of his predecessors as regards the truly apostolic traditions which they did record.

Thus are we led, by internal evidence solely, to what Papias stated had been communicated to him as a tradition, viz., that Mark in his Gospel recorded things related by Peter; but we must add, not Mark alone, but Luke and Matthew also —only we may readily grant that it is Mark who tells the stories with such graphic fulness of detail as to give us most nearly the very words of the eyewitness. To this Renan bears testimony. He says (p. xxxix.): 'Mark is full of minute observations, which, without any doubt, come from an eyewitness. Nothing forbids us to think that this eyewitness, who evidently had followed Jesus, who had loved Him, and looked on Him very close at hand, and who had preserved a lively image of Him, was the Apostle Peter himself, as Papias would have us believe.'

If you will take the trouble to compare any of the stories recorded by St. Mark with the corresponding passages in the other Evangelists, you will be pretty sure to find some example of these autoptic touches. Read, for instance, the history of the miracle performed on the return from the

mount of Transfiguration (ix. 14), and you will find the story told from the point of view of one of the little company who descended with our Lord. We are told of the conversation our Lord held with them on the way down. Next we are told how, when they caught sight of the other disciples, they saw them surrounded by a multitude, and scribes questioning with them; and how when our Lord became visible there was a rush of the crowd running to Him. It is then Mark alone who records the conversation between our Lord and the parent of the demoniac child; who tells the father's half-despairing appeal: 'If thou canst do anything;' and then, when our Lord has said that all things are possible to him that believeth, the parent's agonizing cry: 'Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief;' and then, as the child's convulsive struggles drew new crowds running, the performance of the miracle. This one narrative would suffice to banish the idea, taken up by some hasty readers, that Mark was a mere copyist and abridger—an idea indeed countenanced by St. Augustine, who says of Mark, 'Matthæum secutus tanquam pedissequus et breviator' (*De consens. Evangg.* 1. 4). It is Mark who tells that when children were brought to our Lord, He took them up in His arms and blessed them (ix. 36, x. 16). It is Mark who, in telling of the feeding of the multitude (vi. 39), depicts the companies showing as garden-beds (πρασιαὶ πρασιαί) on the 'green grass.' It is Mark who tells of the little boats which accompanied the vessel in which, during the storm, our Lord lay asleep on the pillow; Mark again who tells of the look of love which our Lord cast on the young man (x. 17) who asked what he should do to inherit eternal life; and again of His look of anger on the hypocrites who watched Him (iii. 5). I have already referred to Mark's record of different Aramaic words used by our Lord. He gives us also several proper names—the name of the father of Levi the publican, the name and father's name of the blind man healed at Jericho, and the names of the sons of Simon of Cyrene. Baur struggled hard to maintain that all these details were but arbitrary additions of a later writer, who having a pretty turn for invention and an eye for pictorial details, used his gifts in ornamenting the simple narrative

of the primitive Gospel. But subsequent criticism has generally acknowledged the view to be truer which recognizes in these details particulars which had fastened themselves on the memory of an eyewitness. And I cannot read the early chapters of St. Mark without the conviction that here we have the narrative, not only in its fuller but in its older form. Observe how carefully the name Peter is withheld from that Apostle until the time when it was conferred by our Lord: in the opening chapters he is only called Simon. Again, Mark alone tells of the alarm into which our Lord's family was cast by His assuming the office of a public teacher: how they thought He was out of His mind, and wished to put Him under restraint. Again, on comparing Mark's phrase, vi. 3: 'the carpenter, the son of Mary,' with Matthew's in the parallel passage, xiii. 55: 'the carpenter's son, the son of Joseph,' I am disposed to accept the former as the older form. When Jesus first came forward, He would probably be known in His own city as the carpenter; and if, as seems likely, Joseph was dead at the time, as the son of Mary. But after our Lord devoted Himself to the work of public teaching, and ceased to labour at His trade, He would be known as the carpenter's son. Justin Martyr shows his knowledge of both Gospels by his use of both titles. On the whole, internal evidence gives ample confirmation to the tradition that Mark's Gospel took its origin in a request, made by those who desired to have a permanent record of the things Peter had said, that Peter's trusted companion should furnish them with such a record.*

Does it follow, then, that Mark's was the earliest Gospel of all, and that it was used by the other two Evangelists? Not necessarily; and the result of such comparison as I have been able to make is to lead me to believe that Matthew and Luke did not copy Mark, but that all drew from a common

* I fear Klostermann's remark is a little too ingenious (cited by Godet, *Études Bibliques*, ii. 38), that some statements become clearer if we go back from Mark's third person to Peter's first. For example (Mark i. 29): 'They entered into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John.' If we look for the antecedent of 'they,' we find that it includes James and John. But all would have been clear in Peter's narrative, '*We* entered into *our* house with James and John.'

source, which, however, is represented most fully and with most verbal exactness in St. Mark's version. It is even possible that the second Gospel may be the latest of the three. It contains a good deal more than the Petrine tradition; and it is conceivable that when Mark was asked to record that tradition, he chose to complete it into a Gospel; and that he may even have used in his work the other two Synoptics, which may have been then already written. Whether they were so or not is a question on which I do not feel confidence in taking a side.

It has been contended that the fact that Mark contains so little outside the Petrine tradition, that is not found either in Matthew or Luke, is most easily explained on the supposition that he was the latest; for if it was the case that the other two Evangelists had used his work, it is hardly likely that their borrowings would have so supplemented each other as to leave nothing behind. Although in many places Mark's narrative compared with the others shows clear indications of priority, there are other places where I find no such indications, and where the hypothesis that Mark simply copied Matthew or Luke seems quite permissible.

But here the question becomes complicated with one on the criticism of the text; for our decision is seriously affected according as we recognize or not the last twelve verses as an integral part of the Gospel. Some of these verses appear to give an abridged account of what is more fully told elsewhere: in particular, one of them reads like a brief reference to Luke's account of the appearence to the two disciples at Emmaus. The current of critical opinion runs so strongly in favour of the rejection of these verses that it seems presumptuous to oppose it. But no one can be required to subscribe to a verdict which he believes to be contrary to the evidence; and he sufficiently satisfies the demands of modesty if, in differing from the opinion of persons of higher authority than himself, he expresses his dissent with a due sense of his own fallibility. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the critical question. Here I have only to observe how the question is affected by the view I take that in Mark we have the Petrine tradition completed into a Gospel. Of course, it is not to be

expected that there should be uniformity of style between verses that belong to the tradition and those which belong to the framework in which it is set; and, therefore, arguments against the last twelve verses, drawn from a comparison of their language with that of other parts of the Gospel, at once lose their weight. On the other hand, if we compare the last twelve verses with the first fifteen, we do find features of resemblance, and in particular I think that it is either on the opening verses or on the concluding ones the still prevalent idea that Mark's Gospel is an abridgment of the others is founded. And opening and conclusion seem to me to have equal rights to be regarded as part of the framework in which the tradition is set.

It seems to me also that the hand of the writer of the concluding verses is to be found elsewhere in the Gospel. Three times in these concluding verses attention is called to the surprising slowness of the disciples to believe the evidence offered them (*vv.* 11, 13, 14). Now, you will find that the thought is constantly present to the mind of the second Evangelist, how slow of heart were the beholders of our Lord's miracles; how stubborn the unbelief which the evidence of these miracles was obliged to conquer. Thus, in the account of the healing of the man with the withered hand (common to the three Synoptics), Mark alone relates (iii. 5) that before commanding the man to stretch forth his hand our Lord looked round on the bystanders 'with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.' Again, in Mark vi. 6 there is a note special to this Evangelist: 'Jesus marvelled because of their unbelief.' And in the history of the tempest on the lake of Gennesaret, told both by Matthew and Mark, there is a noticeable difference between the two accounts. Where Matthew (xiv. 33) tells of the conviction effected by the miracle in those who beheld it, Mark (vi. 52) has instead an expression of surprise at the stupidity and hardness of heart of those who had not sooner recognized our Lord's true character.

Believing, then, the existing conclusion to have been part of the second Gospel, ever since it was a Gospel, I look on the marks of posteriority which it exhibits as affecting the

whole Gospel; and I am, therefore, disposed to believe that Mark's is at once the oldest and the youngest of the three Synoptics: the oldest as giving most nearly the very words in which the apostolic traditions were delivered; the youngest as respects the date when the independent traditions were set in their present framework.

NOTE

ON

THE CONCLUDING VERSES OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

THE following is a statement of my reasons for thinking that in this instance critical editors have preferred—(I.) later testimony to earlier, and (II.) a less probable story to a more probable. The question is one that stands by itself, so that the conclusions here stated may be adopted by one who has accepted all Westcott and Hort's other decisions.

I. As to the first point there is little room for controversy. (1) The disputed verses are expressly attested by Irenæus in the second century, and very probably by Justin Martyr, who incorporates some of their language, though, as usual, without express acknowledgment of quotation. The verses are found in the Syriac version as early as we have any knowledge of it; in the Curetonian version as well as in the Peshitto. Possibly we ought to add to the witnesses for the verses—Papias, Celsus, and Hippolytus. On the other hand, the earliest witness against the verses is Eusebius, in the fourth century, whose testimony is to the effect that some of the copies in his time contained the verses, and some did not; but that those which omitted them were then the more numerous, and, in his opinion, the more trustworthy. There is no reason for doubting this testimony; but Eusebius stands strangely alone in it. It is true that several writers used to be cited as bearing independent witness to the same effect. But all this confirmatory testimony was demolished by Dean Burgon in what seems to me the most effective part of his work 'On the Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark.' He shows that three of the authorities cited reduce themselves to one. A homily of uncertain authorship having been inserted among the works of three different writers; each of these writers was separately cited as a witness. And he shows, further, that all the writers cited do no more than copy, word for word, what had been said by Eusebius; and in some cases indicate that they were of a different opinion themselves. Dr. Hort replaces, or reinforces these discredited witnesses by an argument, *ex silentio*, that the disputed verses were unknown to Cyril of Jerusalem, who otherwise would not have failed to use them in his catechetical lectures.

But the argument from silence is always precarious. It is a common experience with everyone who makes a speech or writes a book to find after he has brought his work to a conclusion that he has failed to use some telling argument which he might have employed. Dr. Hort owns that the same argument might be used to prove that the verses were unknown to Cyril of Alexandria and to Theodoret, neither of whom could possibly be ignorant of the verses, which in their age were certainly in wide circulation. But supposing it proved that the text of St. Mark used by Cyril of Jerusalem did not contain the verses, it only results that the recension approved by the great Palestinian critic, Eusebius, found favour in Palestine for a few years after his death. We still fail to find any distinct witness against the verses who, we can be sure, is independent of Eusebius.

It is more to the point, that Dr. Hort contends by a similar argument from silence that neither Tertullian nor Cyprian knew the disputed verses. In order to maintain this thesis, as far as Cyprian is concerned, Dr. Hort is forced to contend that the quotation by a bishop at one of Cyprian's councils, of words of our Lord, 'In my name, lay on hands, cast out devils,' implies no knowledge of Mark xvi. 17, 18! All extant copies of the old Latin, with but one exception, recognize the disputed verses; but that one has so many points of agreement with the quotations of Cyprian that it seems probable that the translation first in use in Africa was made from a copy of the shorter version. On the other hand, the disputed verses were used in the West by Irenæus, and were in the Curetonian version, which has many affinities with the old Latin. Indeed we are led to suspect that Eusebius must have been guilty of some exaggeration in his account of the general absence of the verses from MSS. of his day. The presence of the verses in all later MSS., and the testimony of writers who lived within a century of Eusebius, prove that the scribes of the generation next to him found copies containing the verses, and that, notwithstanding his great authority, they gave them the preference. And, if the argument from silence is worth anything, the fact deserves attention, that we have no evidence that any writer anterior to Eusebius remarked that there was anything abrupt in the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel, or that it gave no testimony to our Lord's Resurrection.

(2) 'But the two great uncials B and ℵ agree in rejecting the verses, and though these be but fourth-century MSS., yet as they were made from different archetypes, the common parent of these archetypes, presumably the common source of readings in which they agree, is likely to have been as old as the second century.' Let it be granted that this inference holds good in the case of ordinary agreements between B and ℵ; but the present case is exceptional. The MSS. are here not independent, the conclusion of St. Mark being transcribed in both by the same hand. This was pointed out by Tischendorf; but it is to be observed that his opinion does not merely rest on his general impression of the character of the handwriting, concerning which only an expert like himself would be competent to judge. He gives a multitude of conspiring proofs, which can be verified

by anyone who refers to the published facsimile of the Sinaitic MS. The leaf containing the conclusion of St. Mark is one of six leaves which differ from the work of the Sinaitic New Testament scribe and agree with that of the Vatican in a number of peculiarities: in the shape of certain letters, for instance Ξ; in the mode of filling up vacant space at the end of a line; in the punctuation; in the manner of referring to an insertion in the margin; in the mode of marking the end of a book, including what Tischendorf calls arabesques, or ornamented finials, those used in the Sinaitic being quite unlike those used in the Vatican, except in the leaves now under consideration. Further, in these leaves the words ἄνθρωπος, υἱός, οὐρανός, are written at full length, as in the Vatican, not abbreviated, as elsewhere in the Sinaitic. Again, these leaves agree with the Vatican against the Sinaitic as to certain points of orthography. For instance, Pilate's name is spelt with ι in the Sinaitic, with ει in these leaves and in the Vatican; Ἰωάννης is spelt with one ν by the Vatican scribe, with two by the Sinaitic. Such an accumulation of indications does not come short of a demonstration; and, accordingly, Tischendorf's conclusion is accepted by Dr. Hort, who says (p. 213): 'The fact appears to be sufficiently established by concurrent peculiarities in the form of one letter, punctuation, avoidance of contractions, and some points of orthography. As the six leaves are found on computation to form three pairs of conjugate leaves, holding different places in three distant quires, it seems probable that they are new or clean copies of corresponding leaves which had been executed by the scribe who wrote the rest of the New Testament, but had been so disfigured either by an unusual number of clerical errors, or from some unknown cause, that they appeared unworthy to be retained, and were therefore cancelled and transcribed by the "corrector."' Tischendorf's view, that these leaves were transcribed by the 'corrector' is confirmed by the fact that these leaves themselves contain scarcely any corrections. Not that they do not require them. In the first verse of Mark xvi., for instance, there is a very gross blunder which could not have failed to be discovered if the leaf had been read over; but it is intelligible that the 'corrector,' whose duty it was to read over the work of other scribes, thought it unnecessary to read over his own.

But why was this leaf cancelled? On inspection of the page, two phenomena present themselves, which go far to supply the answer. First, on looking at the column containing the conclusion of St. Mark, and at the next column, containing the beginning of St. Luke, it is apparent that the former is written far more widely than the latter. There are, in fact only 560 letters in the former column, 678 in the latter. This suggests that the page as originally written must have contained something of considerable length which was omitted in the substituted copy. Unless some precaution were taken an omission of the kind would leave a telltale blank. In fact, if the concluding column of St. Mark had been written in the same manner as elsewhere, there would have been a whole column blank. But by spreading out his writing the scribe was enabled to carry over 37

letters to a new column, the rest of which could be left blank without attracting notice, as it was the conclusion of a Gospel. The second phenomenon is that the Gospel ends in the middle of a line, and the whole of the rest of the line is filled up with ornament, while, underneath, the arabesque is prolonged horizontally, so as to form an ornamented line reaching all across the column. This filling up the last line occurs nowhere else in the Sinaitic (though the same scribe has written the conclusion of three other books), nor in the Vatican New Testament. It occurs three or four times in the Vatican Old Testament, but the prolongation of the arabesque has no parallel in either MS. We see that the scribe who recopied the leaf betrays that he had his mind full of the thought that the Gospel must be made to end with *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*, and took pains that no one should add more. I do not think these two phenomena can be reasonably explained in any other way than that the leaf, as originally copied, had contained the disputed verses; and that the corrector, regarding these as not a genuine part of the Gospel, cancelled the leaf, recopying it in such a way as to cover the gap left by the erasure. It follows that *the archetype of the Sinaitic* MS. *had contained the disputed verses*. But what about the archetype of the Vatican? In that manuscript there actually *is* a column left blank following the end of St. Mark, this being the only blank column in the whole MS. All critics agree that the blank column indicates that the scribe was cognizant of something following *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* which he did not choose to copy. But surely before he began St. Luke he would make up his mind whether or not the additional verses deserved a place in his text. If he decided against them he would leave no blank, but begin St. Luke in the next column. But what we have seen in the case of the Sinaitic suggests the hypothesis that the Vatican also as first copied had contained the disputed verses, and that on the leaf being cancelled, the gap left by the omission was bigger than spreading out the letters would cover. Thus both MSS., when cross-examined, give evidence, not against, but for the disputed verses, and afford us reason to believe that in this place these MSS. do not represent the reading of their archetypes, but the critical views of the corrector under whose hand both passed; and as they were both copied at a time when the authority of Eusebius as a biblical critic was predominant, and possibly even under the superintendence of Eusebius himself (for Canon Cook thinks that these two were part of the 50 MSS. which Constantine commissioned Eusebius to have copied for the use of his new capital), we still fail to get distinctly pre-Eusebian testimony against the verses.

II. 'Supposing that we cannot produce against the verses any witness earlier than Eusebius, still Eusebius in the fourth century used a purer text than Irenæus in the second, and, therefore, his testimony deserves the more credit.' Again, I raise no question as to general principles of criticism, nor shall I inquire whether in this case Eusebius was not liable to be unduly influenced by harmonistic considerations; but if we accept the fourth-century witness as on the whole the more trustworthy, it remains to be

considered whether we are to prefer a credible witness telling an incredible story to a less trustworthy witness telling a highly probable one.

The rejection of the verses absolutely forces on us the alternative either that the conclusion which St. Mark originally wrote to his Gospel was lost without leaving a trace of its existence, or else that the second Gospel never proceeded beyond verse 8. The probability that one or other of these two things is true is the exact measure of the probability that the Eusebian form of text is correct.

(1) We may fairly dismiss as incredible the supposition that the conclusion which St. Mark originally wrote to his Gospel unaccountably disappeared without leaving a trace behind, and was almost universally replaced by a different conclusion. It has been suggested that the last leaf of the original MS. became detached, and perished; and it is true that the loss of a leaf is an accident liable to happen to a MS. Such a hypothesis explains very well the *partial* circulation of defective copies of a work. Suppose, for instance, that a very old copy of St. Mark's Gospel, wanting the last leaf, was brought, let us say, to Egypt. Transcripts made from that venerable copy would want the concluding verses; or if they were added from some other authority, indications might appear that the addition had been made only after the Gospel had been supposed to terminate. In this way might originate a local circulation of a defective family of MSS. But the *total* loss of the original conclusion could not take place in this way, unless the first copy had been kept till it dropped to pieces with age before anyone made a transcript of it, so that a leaf once lost was lost for ever.

(2) It has been imagined that the Gospel never had a formal conclusion: but this also I find myself unable to believe. Long before any Gospel was written, the belief in the Resurrection of our Lord had become universal among Christians, and this doctrine had become the main topic of every Christian preacher. A history of our Lord, in which this cardinal point was left unmentioned, may be pronounced inconceivable. And if there were no doctrinal objection, there would be the literary one—that no Greek writer would give his work so abrupt and ill-omened a termination as ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.

Two explanations of the absence of a suitable conclusion have been offered. One is that the Evangelist died before bringing his work to a conclusion. But even in the supposed case, that St. Mark, after writing verse 8, had a fit of apoplexy, the disciple who gave his work to the world would surely have added a fitting termination. The other is that Mark copied a previous document, to which he was too conscientious to make any addition of his own. Then our difficulties are simply transferred from St. Mark to the writer of that previous document. But, not to press this point, we must examine whether internal evidence supports the theory that Mark acted the part of a simple copyist, who did not attempt to set the previous tradition in any framework of his own: and that, consequently

the second Gospel, as it stands now, was the source used by Matthew and Luke in the composition of their Gospels. I do not believe this to be true; and so I find no explanation to make it conceivable that Mark's Gospel could have finished with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.

On the other hand, the opinion that the concluding verses, just as much as the opening ones, belong to the original framework of the Gospel has no internal difficulties whatever to encounter. The twelve verses have such marks of antiquity that Dr. Tregelles, who refused to believe them to have been written by St. Mark, still regarded them as having 'a full claim to be received as an authentic part of the second Gospel.' In fact, we have in the short termination of Codex L, a specimen of the vague generalities with which a later editor, who really knew no more than was contained in our Gospels, might attempt to supply a deficiency in the narrative. The twelve verses, on the contrary, are clearly the work of one who wrote at so early a date that he could believe himself able to add genuine apostolic traditions to those already recorded. If he asserts that Jesus 'was received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God,' he only gives expression to what was the universal belief of Christians at as early a period as anyone believes the second Gospel to have been written (see Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; 1 Peter iii. 22; Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2). This belief was embodied in the earliest Christian Creeds, especially in that of the Church of Rome, with which probable tradition connects the composition of St. Mark's Gospel. Further, the twelve verses were written at a time when the Church still believed herself in possession of miraculous powers. Later, a stumbling-block was found in the signs which it was said (verse 17) should 'follow them that believe.' The heathen objector, with whom Macarius Magnes* had to deal, asked if any Christians of his day really did believe. Would the strongest believer of them all test the matter by drinking a cup of poison? The objection may have been as old as Porphyry, and may have been one of the reasons why Eusebius was willing to part with these verses. We must, therefore, ascribe their authorship to one who lived in the very first age of the Church. And why not to St. Mark?

Thus, while the Eusebian recension of St. Mark presents intrinsic difficulties of the most formidable character, that form of text which has the advantage of attestation earlier by a century and a-half contains nothing inconsistent with the date claimed for it. In spite, then, of the eminence of the critics who reject the twelve verses, I cannot help looking at them

* The author of a book called *Apocritica*, written about A.D. 400, and containing heathen objections against Christianity, with answers to them. In answering an objection founded on the disputed verses, Macarius shows no suspicion that it was open to him to cast any doubt on their genuineness. Nothing is known with certainty about this Macarius, and indeed his book had been known only by a few short extracts, until a considerable portion of it, which had been recovered at Athens, was published in Paris in 1876.

as having been from the first an integral part of the second Gospel; and I regard the discussion of them as belonging not so much to the criticism of the Text as to the subject of the present lecture, the history of the genesis of the Synoptic Gospels.*

* It seems to me that textual critics are not entitled to feel absolute confidence in their results, if they venture within range of the obscurity that hangs over the history of the first publication of the Gospels. Such a task as Bentley and Lachmann proposed to themselves, viz. to recover a good fourth-century text—was perfectly feasible, and has, in fact, been accomplished by Westcott and Hort with triumphant success. I suppose that if a MS. containing their text could have been put into the hands of Eusebius, he would have found only one thing in it which would have been quite strange to him, namely, the short conclusion on the last page of St. Mark, and that he would have pronounced the MS. to be an extremely good and accurate one. But these editors aim at nothing less than going back to the original documents; and, in order to do this, it is in some cases necessary to choose between two forms of text, each of which is attested by authorities older than any extant MS. Now, a choice which must be made on subjective grounds only cannot be made with the same confidence as when there is on either side a clear preponderance of historical testimony. And, further, there is the possibility that the Evangelist might have himself published a second edition of his Gospel, so that two forms of text might both be entitled to claim his authority.

X.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF ST. MATTHEW.

THE HEBREW GOSPEL.

IN this lecture I propose to discuss what amount of credence is due to the statement of Papias that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew—that is, in the later form of the language which was popularly spoken in Palestine in our Lord's time. The question is a very difficult one, on account of the conflict between external and internal evidence. The difficulty I speak of lies in the determination of the exact nature of the relationship between our Greek Gospel and its possible Aramaic predecessors. We need have no difficulty in believing that, before our Gospels, there had been written records of discourses of our Lord and of incidents in His life; that one or more of these may have been in Aramaic, and may have been used by our Evangelists. But when all this has been granted, it still remains a subject for inquiry whether any of these preceding documents had assumed the form of a complete Gospel, and whether our Greek St. Matthew is to be regarded as a mere translation of it, or as an independent work.

It is certain that in very early times Hebrew-speaking Christians had in use Gospels in their own language: and these were quite different in character from the Apocryphal Gospels, of which I mean to speak in the next lecture. It was a necessity for Greek Apocryphal Gospels to be different from the Canonical; for unless they had something new to tell, why should they be written? They were either framed

in the interests of some heresy, the doctrines of which were to obtain support from sayings put into the mouth of our Lord or His Apostles; or else they were simply intended to satisfy the curiosity of Christians on some points on which the earlier Evangelists had said nothing. In either case it was the very essence of these Gospels to tell something different from the Gospels we have. It was quite otherwise with the Hebrew Gospels. They were intended to do the very same thing for the benefit of the disciples who spoke Hebrew that the Greek Gospels were to do for those who could speak Greek. There was no necessity that either class of disciples should be taught by means of a translation from a different language. There were, among those who had personal knowledge of the facts of the Gospel history, men competent to tell the story in either tongue. We might, therefore, reasonably expect that there would be original Gospels in the two languages, proceeding on the same lines, the same story being told in both, and possibly by the same men; and yet, though in substantial, not in absolute, agreement with each other. There would be no *à priori* reason why an independent Hebrew Gospel might not differ as much from our Synoptics, as one of these does from another; and since each of the Synoptics contains some things not told by the rest, so, possibly, might an independent Hebrew Gospel record some sayings or acts of our Lord other than those contained in the Greek Gospels. It is reasonable to believe that if there were any material difference in the way of telling the history, the Hebrew Gospel would be translated into Greek; but if the resemblance between the Hebrew Gospel and one of the Greek ones was in the main very close, it would not be worth while to make a translation of the whole Gospel, and anything special which it contained might pass into Greek independently. I have particularly in my mind the story of the woman taken in adultery. Eusebius, who probably did not read that story in his copy of the Gospel according to St. John, informs us (iii. 39) that Papias had related a story of a woman accused of many sins before our Lord, and that the same story was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Well, I have no difficulty in admitting it to be possible that a perfectly

authentic anecdote of our Lord might have been related in the Hebrew Gospel alone, that this might be translated into Greek, and find its way, first into the margin, ultimately into the text, of one of our Greek Gospels. And it seems to me by no means unlikely that this may afford the true explanation of some more trifling insertions found in Western MSS., which the severity of modern criticism rejects as not entitled to a place in the Greek text. This also may give the explanation of an interpolation in the 20th Matthew, found in some early authorities, containing instructions substantially the same as those given in 14th Luke, against taking the highest place at a feast.

I have said enough to show that there is no antecedent improbability, such as to throw any difficulty in the way of our accepting a statement that an Apostle wrote a Gospel in Hebrew, and that this Gospel was afterwards translated into Greek. Now, that our first Gospel actually is such a translation from one written in Hebrew by St. Matthew is testified by an overwhelming mass of Patristic evidence, which has been accepted as conclusive by a number of the most eminent modern critics. In the first rank of these witnesses must be reckoned Papias, whom I have already quoted. I do not know whether Irenæus can be counted an independent witness: for he knew and valued the work of Papias, and may have thence drawn his information; but as he gives a note of time not found in the extract quoted by Eusebius, he may possibly have derived a tradition from some other source. What Irenæus says (iii. 1) is, that 'Matthew, among the Hebrews, published a Gospel in their own dialect when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and founding the Church.' Again, Eusebius (v. 10) tells a story of Pantænus, who, about the beginning of the last quarter of the second century, was the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, where he accordingly was the teacher of Clement of Alexandria. The tradition, which Eusebius reports with an 'it is said,' is, that Pantænus went to preach to the Indians, and that he found the Gospel of Matthew had got there before him: for that the Apostle Bartholomew had preached to the Indians, and had left them St. Matthew's Gospel written in Hebrew letters,

which they had preserved to the time of Pantænus's visit and later. The external evidence for this tradition, it will be seen, is weak; and it certainly has no internal probability to recommend it. A Greek book would have had a better chance of being understood in India (no matter what that word means) than an Aramaic one.

What these early fathers asserted, those who came after them naturally echoed, so that the testimony of the majority of later writers cannot be regarded as adding much to the weight of these early witnesses: especially as very few of them knew Hebrew, or could say that they themselves had seen the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. We have, however, in St. Jerome a witness who seems above all suspicion. He says that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew words and letters for the sake of those of the circumcision who believed in Christ, and that it is uncertain who translated it into Greek. He adds that a copy of the original Hebrew was then still preserved in the library at Cæsarea, founded by the martyr Pamphilus, and that he himself had transcribed the Hebrew Gospel with the leave of the Nazaræans who lived at Berœa in Syria [Aleppo], and who used that Gospel.* We have the further testimony of Epiphanius,† who was well acquainted with Eastern languages. He mentions the same sect of the Nazarenes to which Jerome refers, for he describes Berœa as one of the places where they most flourished; and he says that they had the Gospel of St. Matthew complete, written in Hebrew, only he is not sure whether they did not

---

* *De Viris illustr.*, 3. Jerome resided in the desert east of Syria, 374–379, and it seems to have been at this period that he made acquaintance with the Hebrew St. Matthew. The work from which the citation is taken was published in 392.

† Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, published his great work on Heresies in 377. We have often reason to remark that the literary work of the Fathers falls short of the modern standard of accuracy; but there is none who is more apt than Epiphanius to make blunders through carelessness, want of critical discrimination, and, through a habit not unknown at the present day, of stating what he guessed might be true, as if he had ascertained it to be true. On this account his unsupported testimony can only be used with great caution. But he is well entitled to be heard on the present question, since Syriac was his native language, and he appears to have been well acquainted with Hebrew, besides knowing Egyptian, Greek, and Latin, whence he was called πεντάγλωσσος.

take away the genealogy from the beginning (*Haer.* 29). This confession of ignorance gives us reason to infer that he does not speak of this Gospel from personal knowledge. In calling their version complete (πληρέστατον) he meant to contrast it with that used by another Jewish sect whom he calls the Ebionites, and which he describes in his next section. They also had a Hebrew Gospel which they called that according to St. Matthew: and this Epiphanius knew, and gives several extracts from it. He tells us that it was not perfect, but corrupted and mutilated (οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ).

In point of external evidence, then, the proof of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel seems as complete as could be desired. Yet there are two considerations to be attended to before we accept all this testimony as absolutely conclusive.

One is, that internal evidence leads us to regard our present Matthew as an original work, not a translation. In the first place, we have translations of Hebrew words: 'They shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us' (i. 23). 'A place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull' (xxvii. 33); 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (xxvii. 46). It is evident these explanations could not have been in the Hebrew original, and that they must have been introduced by the translator, if there was one. Next, there are explanations which show a regard to the case of readers unacquainted with the customs of Palestine at the time in question: 'The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection' (xxii. 23); 'Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner whom they would' (xxvii. 15); 'That field was called the field of blood unto this day' (xxvii. 8); 'This saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day' (xxviii. 15). These explanations would not have been necessary for one writing in Hebrew to the Jews of Palestine, but are quite suitable in a work written in Greek, and expected to pass outside the limits of the Holy Land. I do not venture to lay much stress on instances of paronomasia, to which attention

has been called, such as ἀφανίζουσιν ὅπως φανῶσιν (vi. 16); κακοὺς κακῶς (xxi. 41); nor on expressions such as βαττολογεῖν, πολυλογία. Possibly instances of this kind are not more than might be unconsciously introduced by a translator. But the investigation in which we engaged in the last lecture goes very near to determine the present question. For example, I regard it as almost certain that our first Gospel did not copy the third, nor the third the first, but that both drew from a common source. And I have stated my opinion that the facts are not explained by the supposition that that source was Aramaic: being led to this conclusion by an examination of the coincidences of language in the Greek of the Gospels, and in particular by a study of the manner in which the first Gospel cites the Old Testament. Now, if we come to the conclusion that the first Gospel, such as we have it, shows traces of the use of a Greek source, the only way in which it is possible to maintain the Hebrew original is by adding the hypothesis that the translator of the Gospel into Greek was acquainted with the source in question, and used it to guide him in his work. I will not delay now to speak of the difficulties of this hypothesis, as I shall presently give reasons for thinking it needless to have recourse to it. Nor will I dwell on certain minute marks of originality in our present first Gospel. Some of them, indeed, can better be felt than described; but certainly the impression on any reader of Matthew and Luke is, that one is as much an original as the other.

I pass to the second consideration, namely, that none of the Fathers show acquaintance with any Greek text of the first Gospel other than that we have. If a Hebrew Gospel by St. Matthew had been recognized as a primary source of information concerning our Lord's history, we might expect that more persons than one would have been anxious to translate it into Greek. Actually there is no trace of any Greek text but one, and that seems to have been established in exclusive possession in the days of our earliest witness, Papias. Observe his words: 'Matthew wrote the oracles in Hebrew, and everyone interpreted them as he could.' Here you may take 'everyone' in the strict sense, and understand

Papias to say that there was no Greek translation, and that everyone who desired to use St. Matthew's Gospel was forced to translate it for himself as best he could; or, you may take 'everyone' as more loosely used, and may understand Papias only to say that there was no *authorized* Greek translation, but that certain persons had published translations which each had made to the best of his ability. I rather think the first is what he means: but in either case the point to observe is, that Papias uses the aorist tense ἡρμήνευσε. The days of new independent translation appear to have been over when Papias wrote, and we have every reason to believe that there was one authoritative Greek St. Matthew. The citations of it are as early and as constant as those of the other Gospels. Even those Fathers who tell us that Matthew's Greek Gospel is a translation seem to forget themselves, and elsewhere to speak of it and use it as if it were an original. In short, the Church has never made the difference between the first and the other Synoptic Gospels that this theory demands. I mean the theory that in each of the latter two we have the work of an inspired writer: in the first, a translation made by an unknown interpreter who clearly acted the part rather of an editor than translator, and who in some places inserted explanations and additions of his own.

The difficulty of claiming inspired authority for the Greek St. Matthew has been felt so strongly, that in modern times a theory has been started to which no ancient author gives countenance, namely, that there was a double original: that Matthew first wrote in Hebrew and afterwards himself translated his work into Greek. If we are to reject the testimony of the ancients at all, I should prefer to reject their assertion that the Gospel was originally written in Hebrew; but those who say that it was testify also that there was no authorized translation. On this point both Papias and Jerome are express, so that it seems to me there is no middle course. We must choose between the two hypotheses—a Greek original of St. Matthew, or a lost Hebrew original with a translation by an unknown author.* Or rather, since our

* That the existing Greek text is not authoritative is assumed also by Eusebius. One of the solutions which he offers (*Quaest. ad Marin. II.*)

Greek Gospel bears marks of not being a mere translation, we must choose between the hypotheses that we have in the Greek the Gospel as written by Matthew himself, or the Gospel as written by an unknown writer, who used as his principal materials an Aramaic writing by St. Matthew which has now perished.

We turn back, then, to examine more closely the external evidence for the Hebrew original, when we find that it melts away in a wonderful manner. Observe what is the point to be determined. It is not disputed that Hebrew-speaking sectaries in the third and fourth centuries used a Gospel in their own language, and that they ascribed it to St. Matthew; but the question is, What was the relation of that Gospel to our Greek St. Matthew? was it that of original to translation? For that purpose we must inquire what information is to be had about that Hebrew Gospel. In the next lecture I shall speak of other Apocryphal Gospels; but it is not inconvenient to treat of the Hebrew one separately, because its character is different from that of the others. These last I have described as either supplemental or heretical: that is to say, as either such as assume the Canonical Gospels and try to make additions to their story, or else such as were framed to serve the interests of some heresy. But the Hebrew Gospel is the only one which has pretensions to be an independent Gospel: that is to say, one which claims to be set on a level with the Canonical Gospels, as one accepted by the Church as containing an authentic history of our Lord's life and teaching.

I begin by putting out of court the Ebionite Gospel described by Epiphanius, this being clearly to be banished to the class of heretical gospels. Epiphanius tells us enough about it to make us at any rate sure that this was not the

---

of the difficulty which he finds in Matthew's statement, that Mary Magdalen's visit to the sepulchre took place *ὀψὲ σαββάτων*, is that this phrase, used by the Greek translator, does not quite accurately give the meaning of Matthew's Hebrew text, which would have been better expressed by *βραδίων* than *ὀψέ*. It seems to me not impossible that Eusebius might have got this solution from Papias, and that this might have been the very occasion on which Papias found occasion to observe that Matthew had written his Gospel in Hebrew.

original of our St. Matthew. It contained nothing corresponding to the first two chapters, and its actual beginning was quite different from what we find in the third chapter. The Gospel emanated from the Ebionite sect which I have described already (p. 18), and to which I find it convenient to give the distinctive name of Elkesaite, thereby avoiding some controversy as to the proper extension of the name Ebionite.* These Jewish sectaries, being few in number and not widely diffused, were little known to the Church at large until the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, when an extreme section of them assumed an aggressive and proselytizing attitude, and in particular attempted to make converts at Rome. This section included some men who did not scruple at literary imposture. They produced the Book of Elkesai (see p. 19), and they refashioned for their purposes earlier documents which professed to relate the preaching of Peter. In this way originated the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies. It is for this section that Epiphanius reserves the name Ebionite, giving to the other Judaizers the name of Nazarenes. My judgment concerning what Epiphanius describes as the Ebionite Gospel is, that it was a Greek book compiled by these Elkesaites for the use of their converts, and purporting to be a translation of the Hebrew Gospel. But I am persuaded that these adepts in literary forgery, instead of giving a faithful translation of that Gospel, manufactured a new Gospel of their own, using for that purpose not only the Gospel according to St. Matthew, but also that according to St. Luke, and perhaps also that according to St. John. That this Ebionite Gospel never

* The name Ebionite seems to have been originally given to all Jewish Christians who observed the Mosaic law (Orig. *adv. Cels.* ii. 1); and though the earlier authorities distinguished between those Christians of Jewish birth who, after their conversion, merely continued to observe the Mosaic law themselves, and those who insisted on such observance as necessary to salvation, and who besides denied our Lord's Divinity and His miraculous Conception; yet these early authorities give to both classes the name of Ebionites (see in particular Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 61; Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 27). It seems to have been first towards the end of the fourth century that the name Nazarene was applied (by Epiphanius and Jerome) to the first class, while the name Ebionite was left as the peculiar designation of the second.

existed in Aramaic is more than I can venture to assert;* but I hold that the Gospel which Epiphanius describes was in Greek, and that our Greek Gospels were used in its manufacture.

I have already said that this Elkesaite sect was characterized by an abhorrence of sacrifice, and by an objection to the use of flesh meat; and the extracts given by Epiphanius show how they made their Gospel emphatically sanction these opinions of theirs. In one place (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16) our Lord is made to say: 'I came to put an end to sacrifices, and until ye cease from sacrifices the wrath of God shall not cease from you.' The same hand was evidently at work here that in the Clementine Recognitions (i. 64) makes Peter say to the priests in the temple: 'We are certain that God is only made more angry by the sacrifices which ye offer, seeing that the time of sacrifices is now passed; and because ye will not acknowledge that the time for offering victims has passed, your temple shall be destroyed, and the abomination of desolation set up in the holy place.'†

It was a natural object of solicitude with these Elkesaites to get rid of the encouragement to the eating of flesh afforded by our Lord's participation in the Passover feast. Accordingly, in their Gospel, the disciples' question, 'Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?' receives from our Lord the answer, 'Have I with desire desired to eat this Passover, even flesh, with you?' Two things deserve to be noticed in this passage besides its hostility to the use of flesh. The first is that Epiphanius, in commenting on the two changes introduced by the insertion of the word 'flesh' and of the interrogative particle, describes the latter as made by the addition of the two letters μ, η; showing plainly that it was a Greek book he had before him. The other is, that the text on which the Elkesaite forger has operated is not from St. Matthew's Gospel, but from St. Luke's, viz. xxii. 15.

Another New Testament example of the use of animal food

* Epiphanius states (*Haer.* xxx. 3) that both the Gospel according to St. John and the Acts of the Apostles had been translated into Aramaic.

† We may gather from this Clementine passage in what part of the Gospel the saying quoted by Epiphanius was inserted.

seemed to contradict the teaching of these Elkesaites—I mean the passage which describes locusts as having been the food of John the Baptist. Accordingly they substituted 'His food was wild honey, the taste of which was that of the manna, as a honey-cake dressed with oil' (compare Numbers xi. 8, LXX.) The substitution here of the word ἐγκρίς, a cake, for ἀκρίς, a locust, has convinced the great majority of critics that this Ebionite forger here did not translate from the Hebrew, but worked on the Greek texts of our Gospels.

In the very few fragments of this Gospel that have been preserved there are several other indications of the use of St. Luke besides those already mentioned. It names Zacharias and Elisabeth as the parents of John the Baptist; it dates the preaching of the Baptist, 'Caiaphas being the high priest,' Luke iii. 2. It tells that Jesus, when He came forward as a teacher, was 'about thirty years of age' (Luke iii. 23); and it shows signs of following Luke iii. 21, in the phrase, 'when the people were baptized came Jesus also.' In this Ebionite Gospel what Matthew calls the sea of Galilee becomes the 'lake of Tiberias:' 'lake' being Luke's ordinary phrase and 'Tiberias' John's. And I am disposed to recognize as an indication of the use of St. John's Gospel a point noted by the late Bishop FitzGerald. According to St. John it was the descent of the Holy Ghost at our Lord's baptism which taught the Baptist to recognize Jesus as the Son of God (John i. 33.) Now, according to Matthew's Gospel, John, before the descent of the Holy Ghost, confesses that he has need to be baptized by Jesus. This Ebionite Gospel transposes the confession so as to make it agree with what John's account would at first sight appear to require. And it is only when the Baptist sees the miracle and hears the voice from heaven that he falls at the feet of Jesus, with the prayer, 'I beseech thee, Lord, do thou baptize me.'

Now, according to all the authorities, the genuine Hebrew Gospel was identical, or nearly so, with St. Matthew, so that these coincidences, not with Matthew, but with other Gospels, arrest attention. And considering by what tainted hands this document is presented, I will not detain you with a discussion of the abstract question whether coincidences with Luke and

John ought necessarily to cause us to reject the claim of a document to be regarded as the original Hebrew Gospel. I content myself with expressing my conviction that this Ebionite Gospel of Epiphanius is nothing of the kind. I look on it as a third-century forgery, made with heretical intent by one who was well acquainted with the Greek Gospels, in a workshop discredited by other forgeries and impostures; and I hold that it must be altogether cast out of consideration by anyone who seeks to restore a considerably older document, namely, the Hebrew Gospel in use among those whom Epiphanius and Jerome call Nazarenes, and for which these sectaries claimed the authorship of St. Matthew.

For the same reason it is only with great reserve I can employ another source of information about the Hebrew Gospel, namely, the Clementine Homilies. These frequently quote sayings of our Lord, and they contain other passages resembling texts in the Canonical Gospels, but often differing a good deal from them in form. It was a natural explanation of these variations to suppose that the Clementine writer was quoting a gospel different from any of our four, and to assume that the Gospel which, as a Jewish Christian, he was accustomed to use must have been the Hebrew Gospel. The idea receives some confirmation from the fact that it is Matthew's Gospel which the Clementine quotations ordinarily recall. But they do not so exclusively. In a table of the Clementine Gospel quotations given by Westcott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 468) there are about sixty coincidences with St. Matthew, three with Mark, six with Luke, and four with John. But one thing must be borne in mind before we infer that a peculiarity in the form of a Clementine citation implies that the writer used a different Gospel. It is that when such citations are made in the Homilies Peter is usually the speaker; and he is represented not as reading our Lord's sayings from a book, but as giving his own recollections of His teaching and His acts. The conditions of the story then required that Peter should show himself to be an independent authority, and not the servile copier of a previous record. I feel no doubt that the story of the man born blind, which I have quoted (p. 76), was taken from St. John; and a com-

parison of the two versions shows the amount of licence which the Clementine writer conceived himself at liberty to use. The fact, then, that a report of our Lord's words, made by so arbitrary a writer, differs from the canonical text gives us no assurance that he derived it from the Hebrew Gospel, or even from any written source. On the other hand, since he was no doubt acquainted with the Hebrew Gospel, there is always a possibility of his having used it; and if the same peculiar form of citation occurs more than once, or if it agrees with the citation of another writer, then we are led to regard it as taken from a written source, and not improbably from the Hebrew Gospel.*

When we have cast aside these Elkesaite authorities, we have no more copious source of information about the Hebrew Gospel than St. Jerome; and it might seem that he sets at rest the question of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew, for he tells us that he had seen it himself and made a copy of it. Unfortunately, he goes on to tell us that he proceeded to translate it into Greek and Latin. That alone would lead us to suspect that the book must be something different from our Gospel of St. Matthew, or that, if the latter be a translation, it cannot be an accurate translation. And this suspicion is turned into certainty by abundant extracts which St. Jerome gives from the same book, sufficiently confirmed by the testimony of other Fathers. We are thus enabled to say with certainty that whatever affinities there may have been between this Nazarene Gospel and St. Matthew's, the latter can with no propriety be said to be a translation of the former. The Nazarene Gospel contained some things that

* The most remarkable instance of the kind is the saying 'Be ye approved money-changers' (*γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται*), which I have quoted already (p. 18). The meaning of it was that we ought to emulate the skill of money-changers in understanding how to reject the evil and choose the good (compare 1 Thess. v. 21, a text often quoted in connexion with this saying). The saying is quoted three times in the Clementine Homilies, ii. 51; iii. 50; xviii. 20. Clement of Alexandria, who is lax in his use of non-canonical and even heretical documents, expressly quotes this saying as Scripture (*Strom.* i. 28), and three times again indirectly refers to it (ii. 4; vi. 10; vii. 15). It is also quoted in the second century by the Gnostic Apelles (Epiph. *Haer.* xliv. 2). It is referred to by a whole host of later writers, of whom a list will be found in Nicholson's *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 157.

are not in St. Matthew, and wanted some things that are in St. Matthew,* and told in different ways stories that were common to both. The most interesting of the additions made by the Nazarene Gospel to the Canonical history is its account of our Lord's appearance to James after His resurrection. It runs: 'Now the Lord, when He had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James, and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord till he saw him risen from the dead.' Then our Lord says, 'Bring a table and bread.' And a little further on it is added: 'He took bread, and blessed and brake, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from the dead' (*De Viris Illustr.* 2). We may be sure that if this story had been in the original St. Matthew, it would not have been omitted in the Greek translation, and therefore this one specimen would give ground for the opinion, which the other specimens I shall produce establish beyond doubt, that Jerome's Hebrew Gospel is not a different form of the first Gospel, but to all intents a fifth Gospel.† It is another question whether the story may not be authentic. We know from 1 Cor. xv. 7 that our Lord did appear to James, and nothing forbids us to believe that a true tradition of that appearance may have been preserved. But it is also possible that this very verse of 1 Cor. may have suggested to the Jewish Christian framer of the Nazarene Gospel to supplement the defect of the authentic history by an invented narrative of the details of our Lord's appearance to the venerated head of the Jerusalem Church. And some suspicion

* The proof of this is, that the Hebrew Gospel is the shorter. The Stichometry of Nicephorus gives 2500 *στίχοι* for the length of St. Matthew, and 2200 for that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The authority here cited is a list of ecclesiastical books, with the length of each, which is evidently very old, though only preserved by a ninth-century writer. The reader will find it in Westcott's *N. T. Canon*, p. 552.

† An abstract preserved by Photius (*Cod.* 177) gives us curious information about a work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, directed against a Western writer whose name is not given, but who plainly is Jerome; and one of the charges brought against him is that of having forged a fifth Gospel. Prof. Westcott has noted that the same charge was brought by Julian the Pelagian (Augustine, *Opus Imperf. cont. Julian.*, iv. 88).

is suggested by the fact that St. Paul puts the appearance to James quite late in the list of our Lord's appearances, while the Nazarene account would lead us to regard it as one of the first.

The next specimen which I shall produce deserves remark on many accounts. It is quoted by Origen as well as by Jerome, and so gives us reason to think that the same Hebrew Gospel was used by these two writers. But you must observe that although Origen believed that the original of Matthew's Gospel had been in Hebrew (Euseb. vi. 25), it does not appear that he identified it with the Hebrew Gospel which he quotes; nor can I find that this idea was entertained by any of the other Church writers who quote what they generally call the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The notion seems to have been peculiar to St. Jerome.

Our Saviour is introduced as saying, 'My mother the Holy Ghost lately took me by one of my hairs and carried me to the great mountain Tabor.'* The words 'by one of my hairs' might easily be accounted for as an enlargement of St. Matthew's 'led up of the Spirit' (iv. 1), by an apocryphal addition (founded on Ezek. viii. 3; Bel and the Dragon, 36), and this would be an indication that this Hebrew Gospel is posterior to our Greek St. Matthew. But the phrase 'My mother the Holy Ghost' requires more comment. In the Aramaic the Holy Spirit is denoted by a feminine noun; consequently, in the Gnostic sects, which took their origin where a Shemitic language was spoken, and which deduce the origin of things from a male and female principle, the Holy Spirit is usually the female principle. Hence Hilgenfeld, who tries to discover in St. Matthew an anti-Pauline

* Origen *in Johan.*, tom. ii. 6; *Hom. in Jerem.*, xv. 4; Hieron. *in Mich.*, vii. 6; *in Isai.*, xv. 11; *in Ezech.*, xvi. 13. The first passage quoted from Origen is curious. In expounding St. John's words πάντα δι αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο he includes the Holy Spirit among the πάντα; and adds, that if anyone accepts the Gospel according to the Hebrews, there is still no difficulty in interpreting the words 'my mother the Holy Ghost,' &c., since Jesus said 'Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which sent me, the same is my brother and sister *and mother*.' In the second passage he is explaining the words 'my mother' (Jer. xv. 10), and, in addition to other solutions, notices that which is suggested—'If anyone receives "my mother the Holy Ghost, &c."

Hebrew nucleus, considers that the part ascribed in the first chapter to the Holy Spirit in the generation of our Lord shows that this chapter at least was no part of the original Hebrew, but must have been added by the Greek translator or rather adapter. But St. Jerome gives no hint that the Gospel which he read was defective at the beginning; and it must be borne in mind that if a Gnostic writer spoke of the Holy Spirit as the mother of Christ it would be with reference to His premundane generation. He could without inconsistency adopt Matthew's account of the miraculous birth of Jesus, but would probably lay stress chiefly on the union of Jesus with a higher power at His baptism. In the passage of the Nazarene Gospel which relates the baptism, the Holy Spirit addresses our Lord as 'My Son.' The narrative runs: 'It came to pass, when the Lord had come up from the water, the entire fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon him and said to him, My Son, in all the prophets did I await thee that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee: for thou art my rest, thou art my firstborn Son that reignest for ever.' I may as well quote also the account this Gospel gives of our Lord's coming to be baptized: 'Behold the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him, John the Baptist baptizeth for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. But he said to them, Wherein have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him, except, perchance, this very thing that I have said is ignorance?'

I have given examples enough to show that this Nazarene Gospel was a very different book from our St. Matthew. Lest, however, it should be thought that the difference between the books arises from one of them having received interpolations, I shall show you how differently a story is told which both have in common: 'Another rich man said to Jesus, Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live? He said, Go and sell all that thou hast, and distribute among the poor, and come and follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head and was displeased. And the Lord said to him, How canst thou say thou hast kept the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy

neighbour as thyself: and behold many of thy brethren, children of Abraham, are clothed with dung and dying with hunger, while thy house is full of many good things, and nothing is sent out of it to them?' And turning to His disciple Simon, who sat beside Him, he said: 'Simon son of John, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.'* Again, the man with the withered hand is made to say, 'I was a mason seeking a livelihood by the labour of my hands. I pray thee, Jesus, to restore me to health, that I may not beg my bread in disgrace' (Hieron., *in Matt.* xii. 13). If so ran the original Hebrew St. Matthew, our Greek Evangelist must have been a most unfaithful translator.

Again, the parable of the talents was improved so as not to inflict so severe a punishment on mere sloth. There are three servants: one multiplies his talent; another hides it; the third wastes it with harlots and riotous living. The second is only rebuked; the third is cast into prison.† The only other things about the Hebrew Gospel which I think it worth while to quote are, that instead of relating that the veil of the Temple was rent, it told that a lintel of the Temple of immense size was shattered; and that in the Lord's Prayer, instead of 'daily bread' it had 'bread for the morrow.' This is the meaning of the word ἐπιούσιος, adopted by Bishop Lightfoot (*New Testament Revision*, Appendix); and it is no small argument in his favour that such was the interpretation accepted in Palestine apparently before the end of the first century. But if the Aramaic had been the original, and had said plainly 'bread for the mor-

* This passage is given in the 'vetus interpretatio' of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew* xix. (tom. xv. 14, Delarue, iii. 671). The passage is not found in the extant Greek.

† This is told by Eusebius in one of the Greek fragments of his *Theophaneia*, published by Mai (*Nov. Pat. Bibl.*, iv. 155). The passage does not seem to be contained in the Syriac version translated by Lee, which, however, contains (p. 234) another quotation from the Hebrew Gospel. Some critics, who think unfavourably of other variations of the Nazarene Gospel from the Canonical narrative, find marks of originality in this version of the parable of the talents. But to me this variation seems to show plainly the handiwork of a corrector who fancies he is making an improvement and really changes for the worse. And I suspect that this corrector was acquainted with Luke xv.

row,' it seems to me not likely that so difficult a word would have been used in the translation. The Greek Fathers were as much puzzled by it as ourselves (see Origen, *de Orat.* 27, quoted by Lightfoot, *New Testament Revision*, p. 195).

It would be time wasted if I were to accumulate quotations for the mere purpose of showing that the Nazarene Gospel was not the original of our St. Matthew. The only wonder is, how St. Jerome could ever have permitted himself to think or say that it was. As time went on he certainly became cautious about asserting it, and usually quotes it as 'the Gospel written in the Hebrew language which the Nazarenes read;' and he sometimes adds, 'which is called by most the original of St. Matthew.'* But it is still surprising that he should have accepted this Gospel as the original St. Matthew at a time when he could not have been ignorant of its character: for the very first time he speaks of it he tells that he had already translated it into Greek and Latin, and quotes the story of our Lord's appearance to James. However, our surprise may abate a little when we remember that long before Jerome's time the belief had been accepted in the Church, that St. Matthew's Gospel had been originally written in Hebrew. It was notorious that the Judaizing sects had a Gospel in their own language which they designated as St. Matthew's; and no one ignorant of their language had any reason for doubting the appellation to be correct. St. Jerome would therefore, no doubt, embrace with eager expectation the opportunity of obtaining access to so valuable a help to the criticism of the New Testament text, and would count the power of copying this document as one of the most precious fruits of his Shemitic studies. But after he had become ac-

* 'In evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraei et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum' (*in Matt.* xii. 13, written in A. D. 398). 'Evangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei' (*in Isai.* xi. 2, written in 410). See also *in Ezeh.* xviii. 7 (written in 413). 'In evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni—secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum—quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca' (*Dial. adv. Pelag.* iii., written in 416). Jerome's first mention of the book is in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*, written in 392.

quainted with it, and had found that instead of enabling him to correct a reading here and there in the Greek St. Matthew, it was a work so different from the Canonical Gospel that a new translation was necessary in order to inform a Greek reader of its contents, how was it that Jerome did not then perceive that unless he owned the two books to have been different from the beginning, he must either hold the Canonical St. Matthew to have been an unfaithful translation, or else the Nazarene Gospel to have been since foully corrupted? In answering this question we must call to mind what was the great work of Jerome's life. When he became acquainted with the Hebrew Bible he found it in many respects to be very different from the Septuagint and its Latin translations, which were in current use all over the Christian world. He set himself to revise the current text, so as to bring it into conformity with the original Hebrew; and on account of the preference he gave to the latter, he met with much opposition and calumny from his contemporaries. Now it is reasonable to suppose that, notwithstanding some striking variations, there was a good deal of resemblance between the Nazarene Gospel and the Canonical Gospel of St. Matthew. The differences were probably not greater than Jerome had found in many places between the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament. I believe, then, that Jerome, taking up the Nazarene Gospel with every prepossession in its favour, was not hindered by these differences from accepting it as the original text of St. Matthew, and that he gave it the preference which, in the case of the Old Testament books, he had given to the Hebrew over the Greek text. I do not know that he ever quite abandoned this view, though as years went on he became more cautious in expressing it. But though we gratefully follow St. Jerome in using an Old Testament text cleared of the accretions which, in Greek and Latin Bibles, had gathered round the original, we may rejoice that he could not succeed in persuading the Church to exchange the Greek for the Aramaic St. Matthew.*

* Some light is thrown on Jerome's statement, that he translated the Nazarene Gospel into Greek, by the fact that his version of the Psalms and of the Prophets was, with his approval, rendered into Greek by Sophronius (*De Viris Illustr.* 134, *Praef. in Pss.*).

When we have arrived at the conclusion that the Hebrew Gospel known to St. Jerome was not the original of St. Matthew, but to all intents a fifth Gospel, we have still to consider what we ought to think of it. Is it to be ranked with our Canonical four, or with the Apocryphal Gospels of which I have next to speak? I am conscious that it is difficult for us to divest our minds of prejudice when we try to make a purely literary comparison of the Hebrew and the Canonical Gospels. However freely we acknowledge that there was nothing in the nature of things to forbid our having five Gospels, yet, as the Church for so many centuries has only acknowledged four, we are not now inclined to reopen the question; and we can scarcely be quite impartial in our comparison of words we have venerated from our childhood with words which come to us as strange and novel. So, perhaps, I might distrust my own judgment when the story of the rich man scratching his head impresses me, in respect of claim to priority over the Canonical narrative, as on a level with the versions of New Testament stories which good ladies sometimes publish for the use of children. It is therefore a satisfaction to me that, in asserting the immense superiority in originality and simplicity of our Greek St. Matthew over the Nazarene Gospel, I have the adhesion of the great majority of those critics who pay least regard to the authority of ecclesiastical tradition. Indeed, critics of the sceptical school have generally adopted Schleiermacher's idea, that the Hebrew St. Matthew contained nothing but discourses; and so they have felt no temptation to take under their patronage this Nazarene Gospel, which clearly dealt in narrative just as much as the Canonical. Hilgenfeld is almost the only critic of note who attributes originality to this Hebrew Gospel. But he owns that he is the advocate of a nearly abandoned cause. Volkmar, Strauss, Renan, Keim, Lipsius, Weizäcker agree in the opinion which I express in the words of Anger quoted by Hilgenfeld: 'Evangelium Hebraeorum, testantibus quae supersunt reliquiis, cognatum cum Ev. Matthaei, iis in rebus, in quibus ab eo differt, nunquam certo formam principalem, plerumque indubitate formam derivatam praebet.' Indeed it is quite

intelligible that the traditions of a small sect, which was isolated from the Christian world, and on that account uncontrolled in its procedure, should be liable to depravation and corruption, from which our Gospels were secured, if by nothing else, by the mere fact that they so rapidly became the property of mutually distant Churches.*

When we have acknowledged that this Nazarene Gospel, so far from being the mother, or even the sister, of one of our Canonical four, can only claim to be a granddaughter or grandniece, it does not follow that it stands on no higher level than the Apocryphal Gospels. It is at least favourably distingnished from them by not being open to the charge which I brought against the rest (p. 119), that they are silent about our Lord's public life, concerning which it is not incredible that true traditions might be in circulation; while they speak copiously on matters about which the narrators were not likely to have had means of real knowledge. We may disregard tales of the latter kind as idle chatter, and yet think ourselves bound to give a hearing to stories concerning our Lord's public life which circulated at no great distance from Him in time or place. But I own that, after giving them a hearing, I have not felt disposed to attribute to them any high value. The most favourable verdict I have in any case been able to pass is, that I will not venture to say that some of them may not have had a foundation in truth. For example, the saying 'Be ye good money-changers,' or another quoted by Jerome, 'Be ye never glad but when you see your brother in charity,' may, for all I know, have been derived from some actual sayings of our Lord.

Before I quit the subject of this Hebrew Gospel, I ought to mention that the earliest trace of its existence is that Ignatius (*ad Symrn.* 3), in arguing against a Docetic conception of our Lord's body, says, 'And when, after His resurrection, He came to Peter and his company, He said, "Take, handle me,

* So Renan, v. 104: 'Notre Matthieu s'est conservé intact depuis sa rédaction définitive, dans les dernières années du 1er siècle, tandis que l'Évangile hébreu, vu l'absence d'une orthodoxie, jalouse gardienne des textes, dans les Églises judaïsantes de Syrie, a été remanié de siècle en siècle, si bien qu' à la fin il n'était pas fort supérieur à un Évangile apocryphe.'

and see that I am not a spirit without body"' (δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον). We might suppose that this was a free quotation of Luke xxiv. 39; but we find from Jerome that the words 'incorporale daemonium' were found in his Nazarene Gospel, to which accordingly he refers this quotation.* It would be quite natural that Ignatius, being a native of Syria, should use an Aramaic Gospel. On the other hand, it is to be remarked that Eusebius, who quotes this phrase from Ignatius (*H. E.* iii. 36), does not know where he got it; and yet Eusebius, at least when he wrote the *Theophaneia*, knew the Hebrew Gospel. Again, Origen in the preface to his Περὶ Ἀρχῶν (Delarue, i. 47) says that the saying is derived from the apocryphal book *Doctrina Petri*. It is best to acknowledge that our means of information do not enable us to speak positively as to the filiation of these different documents. In any case we know that Hegesippus, in the second century, used the Hebrew Gospel (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22).†

I return to the question as to the original language of St. Matthew, respecting which the evidence takes a new complexion from what we have learned as to the Nazarene Gospel. We might have lightly regarded the assertion that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Hebrew, if it were made only by men who had never seen the book, or who did not understand the language, and were therefore incompetent to judge whether the Aramaic book which was in use among certain Jewish sectaries could justly claim priority over the Greek Gospel. But the question seemed decided by the testimony of St. Jerome, who had himself examined the Aramaic book. But now Jerome, when cross-examined, passes over as a witness to the opposite side, convincing us of the comparative lateness of the only Aramaic Gospel that

---

* *De Viris Illustr.* 16; *in Isai.* Lib. 18, *Praef.*

† On the New Testament quotations of Ignatius, see Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, p. 595, *et seqq.*; and Lightfoot's Index, *Ignatius*, ii. p. 1107. The Fragments of the Hebrew Gospel have been often collected. The most recent collections are by Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 452, *et seqq.*; Nicholson, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*; Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, the section treating of the Gospel according to the Hebrews having been lately published in a second edition, 1884.

any of the witnesses had seen. We have therefore to fall back on the earlier witnesses, and we have now to consider what their evidence is worth, especially when we bear in mind that if their opinion was influenced by belief in the pretensions made for the Hebrew Gospel of their own day, they were mistaken in that belief. If, for example, we think the 'it is said' of Eusebius sufficient evidence to induce us to believe that Pantaenus was shown in India a Gospel in Hebrew letters, we may still reasonably doubt whether this was a copy of the original St. Matthew left there by St. Bartholomew, or simply a copy of the Nazarene Gospel. As for our earliest witness, Papias, I do not attach overwhelming weight to his easy reception of the statement that Matthew's Gospel was originally Hebrew. He knew that Palestine was bilingual, so that the thing would appear to him probable; and it supplied a key to difficulties he may have met with in harmonizing the Gospels; but it is very unlikely that he himself either saw the Gospel, or could read it if he did see it. If we had not better evidence, I doubt if we could attribute much value to the opinion of a bishop of Phrygia as to the extent to which Palestine had been bilingual fifty years before; for this is a point on which distance of place is a great bar to accurate knowledge. I could ask questions as to the language or dialect spoken in different parts of the Continent that I dare say most of you would beg to be excused from answering. I doubt whether many educated Frenchmen would have confidence in saying whether a Welsh Member of Parliament would address his constituents in Welsh, or an Irish one in Irish.

Actually, however, I believe that Greek was as generally spoken in Palestine in our Lord's time as English now is in the West of Ireland. Greek was the language of the law courts and of business. Accordingly, a knowledge of Greek could only be dispensed with by those who were too high or too low to be concerned in mercantile matters. I think, however, that Josephus has been misunderstood when he has been supposed to say (*Ant.* xx. 12) that those of high rank did not know Greek. What he says is, that a knowledge of foreign languages was an accomplishment in which they took

no pride, it being one possessed by the lower class of freemen, and even by slaves. 'Those only were regarded as wise who were accurately acquainted with the law, and were able to interpret the Holy Scriptures.' In the Acts, you will remember that the chief captain, taking Paul for a leader of sicarii, is surprised that he can speak Greek. On the other hand, when Paul addresses the people from the Temple steps, they expect him to speak Greek, but are gratified, and become attentive, on being addressed in their own language. Peter's discourse on the day of Pentecost, and his address to Cornelius, must, from the nature of the case, have been delivered in Greek; and it is not unreasonable to think the same of some other speeches recorded in the early chapters of the Acts. Dr. Roberts, in his interesting book, *Discussions on the Gospels*, contends that our Lord Himself commonly spoke Greek, and he at least makes it probable that He did so sometimes.* He appeals to what we are told (Mark iii. 7) of a great multitude having followed our Lord 'from Idumea and from beyond Jordan, and they about Tyre and Sidon,' the presumption being that if they followed Him they could understand His teaching; and people from the regions just named would not be likely to do this unless He spoke Greek. He draws another proof from St. John's report of our Lord's conversation with Pilate, in which we are not told that the services of an interpreter were employed. Greek seems to have been more prevalent in Galilee, which is called Galilee of the Gentiles, than in Jerusalem. St. Matthew, as a collector of taxes, could hardly have dispensed with a knowledge of Greek. We know that the two Jewish Apostles, Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, and James, the head of the Jerusalem Church, have left Epistles in Greek. And, what is remarkable, the letter of that specially Jewish Apostle, St. James, is perhaps the best Greek in the New Testament.

The conclusion, then, which I draw from these facts is, that there is not the least difficulty in believing that Matthew might have written a Gospel in Greek, even on the supposition

* On the other side of the question deserves to be studied an essay by Neubauer, *Studia Biblica*, 1885.

that he intended it only for the use of the Christians in Palestine; and the first Gospel contains internal evidence that it was meant to have a wider circulation. On the other hand, the proof I have given from Josephus (p. 141) of the literary use of the Aramaic language in his time makes it equally easy to accept evidence of the existence of an apostolic Hebrew Gospel, if only decisive evidence for its existence were forthcoming. But it does not appear that any of the witnesses had themselves seen such a Gospel, and there is no evidence of the existence of any Greek text but the one which was universally regarded as authoritative. Cureton imagined that he could gain evidence for the Hebrew original of St. Matthew from the Syriac version which he published, and which he contended had not been made from Greek, but from the original Aramaic. However, on that point he has failed to convince scholars.* I cannot help thinking that if there had existed in use among Hebrew-speaking Christians what was known to be the real original Gospel written by St. Matthew, such a corrupt version of it as that circulated among the Nazarenes could not have gained acceptance; and that the origin of the latter Gospel is more easily explained if we suppose that it was in Greek the facts of the Gospel history had been authoritatively published, and if we regard the Nazarene Gospel as an attempt made by one not very scrupulous about accuracy to present these facts to those who spoke Aramaic. For these reasons, and on account of the signs of originality already mentioned, which are presented by the Greek Gospel, I am disposed to pronounce in favour of the Greek original of St. Matthew.

But it has been objected, The great majority of the early witnesses who tell us that Matthew wrote a Gospel tell us also that he wrote it in Hebrew. If you do not accept their testimony on the latter point, why accept it on the former? And then what reason is there for supposing that our present

* See his Preface, p. vi., and an interesting section on the Hebrew Gospel, pp. lxxiv., &c. Renan says (v. 98): 'C'est bien à tort qu'on a supposé que la version syriaque de Saint Matthieu publiée par Cureton a été faite sur l'original araméen de Saint Matthieu. L'idée qu'elle serait cet original même est tout à fait chimérique.

Greek Gospel comes from St. Matthew at all? Well, I do not think that the two things stand on the same level of testimony. In the case of Papias, for example, it seems to me plain that the Gospel of which he speaks bore the title of St. Matthew, and was accepted as such by the Christian world of the time. The statement that it had been written in Hebrew rests on a private tradition, for all we know, first made public by Papias himself: and Papias has been generally condemned as over credulous with respect to some of the traditions which he accepted. If the Greek Gospel had been, as some suppose, only based on the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, but was actually the work of one of the second generation, I do not know why the name of the real author should have been suppressed; for the second and third Gospels bear the names of those who were supposed to be their real authors, and not those of the Apostles on whose authority they were believed to rest. So that, if Matthew did not write the first Gospel, I do not think the name of Matthew would have been necessary to gain it acceptance in the Church. In any case, the fact of this acceptance by the Church may suffice for our faith; for though I believe the first Gospel to have been written by an Apostle, and the second and third not, I make no difference in my reception of them, nor do I find that any such difference was ever made by Christians. From the earliest times of which we have knowledge all were alike received as indisputably authentic records of the deeds and words of Christ.

XI.

APOCRYPHAL AND HERETICAL GOSPELS.

SOME fifty years ago or more, a Mr. Hone,* who was at that time an opponent of orthodoxy, if not of Christianity (though I understand he afterwards regretted the line he had taken), published what he called the Apocryphal New Testament, which had considerable sale at the time, and which may still be picked up on stalls or at auctions. The object of the publication clearly was to disparage the pre-eminent authority which we ascribe to the books of our New Testament, by making it appear that those which we honour had been picked out of a number of books with tolerably equal claims to our acceptance, the selection having been made by persons in whom we have no reason to feel much confidence. The work professes to be an answer to the question, 'After the writings contained in the New Testament were selected from the numerous Gospels and Epistles then in existence, what became of the books that were rejected by the compilers?' The epoch of the compilation is apparently assumed to be that of the Council of Nicæa. The writer, at least, quotes a mediæval story, that the selection of Canonical books was then made by miracle, the right books having jumped up on the table, and the wrong ones remained under it; and it would seem as if, though rejecting the miracle, he received the fact that the Council settled the Canon. He

* The same who gained a victory over the Government of the day by an acquittal on a charge of blasphemous libel, tried before Lord Ellenborough in 1817.

proceeds to quote some remarks from Jortin on the violence of the proceedings at the Council, and we are given to understand that if the selection was not made then, it was made by people not more entitled to confidence. He then gives a selection of Apocryphal Gospels, Acts and Epistles, taken from works of orthodox writers, but divided by himself into verses (and, where that had not been done before, into chapters), obviously with the intention of giving to these strange Gospels, Epistles and Acts, as nearly as possible the same appearance to the eye of the English reader as that presented by the old ones with which he was familiar.

I need not tell you that the Council of Nicæa did not meddle with the subject of the Canon, and so we need not trouble ourselves to discuss the proofs that the members of that venerable Synod were frail and fallible men like ourselves. The fact is that, as I have already told you, authority did not meddle with the question of the Canon until that question had pretty well settled itself; and, instead of this abstention weakening the authority of our sacred books, the result has been that the great majority have far higher authority than if their claims rested on the decision of any Council, however venerable. They rest on the spontaneous consent of the whole Christian world, Churches the most remote agreeing independently to do honour to the same books. Some of the books which Mr. Hone printed as left out by the compilers of our Canon were not in existence at the time when that Canon established itself; and the best of the others is separated, in the judgment of any sober man, by a very wide interval from those which we account Canonical. Mr. Hone's insinuation has, I understand, been repeated in a later edition, which I have not seen, in a still grosser form; the title-page being 'The Suppressed Gospels and Epistles of the Original New Testament of Jesus Christ, venerated by the primitive Christian Churches during the first four centuries, but since, after violent disputations, forbidden by the bishops of the Nicene Council, in the reign of the Emperor Constantine.'

A work having a title not unlike Hone's was published a few years ago by Hilgenfeld: *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*. But it is a work of a very different kind

from Hone's catch-penny publication, having been compiled by a man of real learning. It includes nothing that is not really ancient, and the greater part of it is occupied with the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, which, indeed, also appear in Hone's collection. I have thought it would be useful to give you, in this course of lectures, some account of those writings which at any time obtained credit in the Church of the same kind as was given to our Canonical Scriptures, though in degree infinitely below that. I speak, then, to-day of Apocryphal Gospels. Hilgenfeld does not admit into his collection any of the Apocryphal Gospels that have come down to us entire; I presume, not judging them of sufficient antiquity to deserve a place. What he gives are merely the fragmentary extracts, which different Fathers have preserved, of the Ebionite Gospels, of which I spoke in the last lecture, and of one or two heretical Gospels, of which I shall speak to-day.

Of Gospels which have come down to us entire, I place first, on many grounds, that called the Gospel of James, or Protevangelium, which has come down to us in more than fifty MSS., and has been translated into many languages both of East and West. The object of this Gospel is clearly supplementary to our Gospels, and it is intended to satisfy the curiosity of Christians with regard to the things which took place before the birth of our Lord. If we are to ascribe to the book any 'tendency' beyond the simple desire to gratify curiosity, the doctrine which the inventor seems most solicitous to establish is that of the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary.

It is this book which invented the names Joachim and Anne for the parents of Mary. It tells how they had been childless to old age; how an angel appearing separately to each of them, announced to them the birth of a child; how they vowed to dedicate to the Lord that which should be born, and how, in fulfilment of this vow, Mary was brought to the Temple at the age of three years. When she comes to the age of twelve, the priests will not take the responsibility of having charge of a marriageable virgin at the Temple, and they seek a widower to whose charge to commit her. All the

widowers are assembled; and in order to choose between them a miraculous test is employed, the idea of which is derived from the history of Aaron's rod that budded. They each give in their rod, and from Joseph's rod alone* there issues a dove, so that he is chosen to have the charge, much against his will, for we are carefully told that he had children already. The story of the appearance of the angel Gabriel and the annunciation of the Saviour's birth is told almost in the words of Luke, except with the addition that the angel appeared to Mary as she was drawing water. We find mention made also of the dumbness of Zacharias, and of the taxing under Cæsar Augustus, in such a way as to leave no room for doubt that Luke's Gospel was used; while the account of Herod and the wise men, the explanation of the name Jesus, 'because he shall save his people from their sins,' and other particulars, are so given as to make it equally clear that this Gospel presupposes St. Matthew's. There is a story that when Mary's pregnancy was discovered, both she and Joseph were made to clear themselves by drinking the water of jealousy. The birth of her child is made to take place, not in the stable of the inn, but in a cave by the roadside where the labour-pains suddenly come on her. A midwife is found, who expresses the greatest amazement at a virgin bringing forth. Salome, who, on hearing of this prodigy, refuses to believe unless she herself verify the fact, is punished by having her hand withered, until, on her repentance, she is healed by touching the child. The work is supposed to be written by James, immediately after the death of Herod; and the last things related are a miraculous rescue of the infant John the Baptist from the massacre of the children, by means of a mountain opening and hiding him and his mother; and a consequent murder of Zacharias the priest by Herod's command, when his child could not be found. This story may be regarded as bearing witness to the presence in the Gospel used by the fabulist of the text, 'Zacharias whom ye slew between the Temple and the altar.'

* Accordingly, a prominent feature in pictures of the Marriage of the Virgin, by Raphael and his predecessors, is that of the disappointed suitors breaking their useless rods.

His blood is represented as miraculously congealing, and refusing to be removed till the avenger came.*

From this sketch of the contents of the Protevangelium you will see that it is merely an attempt to embroider with legend the simpler narrative of the earlier Evangelists, and that it could not have come into existence if they had not gained a position of acknowledged credit long before.

The Gospel which I have described can certainly lay claim to very high antiquity. It was undoubtedly in full circulation before the end of the fourth century, for it is clearly used by Epiphanius in his work on Heresy, written about 376.† We can, without quitting undisputed ground, carry the evidence of the use of the book back to the very beginning of this century; for Peter of Alexandria, who died in 311, gives an account of the death of Zacharias, which is clearly derived from this Gospel.‡ In the preceding century Origen (*in Matt.*, tom. x. 17) speaks of the opinion that the 'brethren of our Lord' were sons of Joseph by a former wife, as a tradition derived from 'the Gospel according to Peter'§ and the 'book of James;' and I see no sufficient reason for doubting that this was in substance the same as the still extant book which bears the name of James. It is true that Origen elsewhere,‖ not professing to quote the book of James, but relating a tradition which had come to him, gives an account of the death of Zacharias different from that already mentioned. He is said to have been put to death, not on the occasion of the

* This story of the blood is derived from a Jewish story of a miraculous bubbling of the blood of Zacharias the son of Jehoiada, which refused to be stilled, though Nebuzaradan slew 94,000 of the chief of the Jews in the hope that by the addition of their blood that of Zacharias might be quieted. —See Whitby's commentary on Matt. xxiii. 35, or *Midrasch Echa Rabbati* (Wünsche's translation), p. 21.

† *Haer.* lxxix. 5; lxxviii. 7: see also Greg. Nyss. *Orat. in diem Natal. Christi*, Opp. Paris, 1638, vol. iii., 346.

‡ Routh's *Rell. Sac.* iv. 44.

§ Of this book no extracts have been preserved, and apparently it never had a very wide range of circulation. It dates from the second century, and our chief information about it is from a letter of Serapion, bishop of Antioch at the end of that century, who had at first permitted the use of it in his diocese, but withdrew his permission on closer acquaintance with the book, which though in the main orthodox, contained some things that favoured the Docetic heresy (Euseb. *H. E.*, vi. 12: see also iii. 3 and 25).

‖ *Series Comm. in Matt.* § 25.

slaughter of the Innocents, but later, and because he had permitted Mary, notwithstanding the birth of her child, to stand in the place assigned to virgins in the Temple. The truth seems to be that more than one of those who accepted from the Protevangelium that the Zacharias slain between the Temple and the altar was the father of the Baptist, attempted to improve on the account there given of the cause of his death. A Gnostic story on the subject is told by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvi. 12); and another orthodox account is reported by Jerome in his commentary on Matthew xxiii. 35. We might be sure that the Protevangelium was the book of which Origen speaks, if we had earlier traces of its existence; but the indications are uncertain. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 16) has the story of the midwife's attestation of Mary's virginity; but it must be owned that Tertullian seems ignorant of this tale (*De Carn. Christ.* 23): and although he knows a story (*Scorpiace* 8) of stones retaining the marks of the blood of Zacharias, the reference seems to be to the Jewish story about the son of Jehoiada, already quoted. Justin Martyr has also been claimed as recognizing the Protevangelium: both, for instance, represent our Lord's birth as taking place in a cave; but this may have been a local tradition (see p. 71). Other coincidences have been pointed out by Hilgenfeld: for instance, the phrase χαρὰν λαβοῦσα Μαριάμ (*Trypho* 100; *Protev.* 12). On the whole, I regard the Protevangelium as a second-century composition; and though I admit that the form now extant may exhibit some variations from the original text, I do not believe that these changes could have been considerable, or such as to affect the general character of the document. You see there is no great misstatement in describing this as one of the books rejected by the framers of our Canon. It was a book which, in point of antiquity, *might* have got into our Canon, unless, indeed, it be admitted that a book only making its appearance in the middle of the second century was far too late to have a chance of being placed on a level with our Gospels.

I pass briefly over Gospels which bear the same relation to the Protevangelium that it bears to the Synoptic Gospels;

and which, if that be the child of these Gospels, are only their grandchildren: I mean fictions which, taking the Protevangelium as their basis, enrich with further ornaments and supplements the story as it was there told. Of such a kind is the Gospel of the pseudo-Matthew, a work not earlier than the fifth century. Some of the particulars, however, which it added to the story have passed into current ecclesiastical mythology. For instance, it tells how Mary, after coming out of the cave, laid her child in a manger, and how the ox and the ass which were there adored the child; thus fulfilling the prophecy, 'the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib;' as also another prophecy of Habakkuk: for in the beginning of the third chapter, where we translate 'in the midst of the years make known,' the Septuagint has 'in the midst of two animals thou shalt be known.' You must be familiar with the ox and the ass in stories and pictures of our Lord's birth. This Gospel tells also of wonders that took place in the flight to Egypt: how lions and leopards adored the child, and harmlessly bore company to the party; how a palm-tree at the child's command bowed down its head and supplied its fruit to satisfy His mother's need; how, when He entered the idol temple in Egypt, the idols all fell with their faces to the ground, and there lay broken and shattered. This pseudo-Matthew contains at the end a section taken from the false Gospel, of which I have next to speak.

The Gospel of St. Thomas treats of the infancy and childhood of our Lord. This work, in its original, does not appear to have taken its rise in the Church, but rather to have been manufactured in a Gnostic workshop: not, indeed, in any of those schools of heresy which taught that our Lord only became Christ at His baptism (for to such teaching the doctrine was directly opposed which made Him exercise miraculous power in His childhood), but rather in the school of Docetism, which denied the true humanity of our Lord: for in these legends all trace disappears that He was, in the real truth of His nature, man. We may believe that there was a desire to do our Lord honour in the invention of tales of the early exercise of His miraculous power; but if so, the

result sadly failed to correspond to the design: for there is none of the Apocryphal Gospels which is so repulsive to a Christian reader, on account of the degrading character of its representations of our Lord. In its pages the holy child is depicted as (to use Renan's forcible language, vi. 541), 'un gamin omnipotent et omniscient,' wielding the power of the Godhead with a child's waywardness and petulance. It tells, for example, that He was playing and making sparrows out of mud, that He did this on the Sabbath, and that when complaint was made against Him, He clapped His hands and the sparrows took life and flew away; and again, that He threw all the clothes in a dyer's shop into a single vat of blue dye, and on being called to account for the mischief He had done, commanded the clothes to be taken out, and lo, every one was dyed of the colour its owner wished. We are told that when He was drawing water for His mother and happened to break the pitcher, He brought the water safely home in the skirt of His garment; and that, when His father, working at his carpenter's trade, found a piece of wood too short for the place it was meant to occupy, the child gave the wood a pull, when it became of the right length. We learn to appreciate more justly the character of the miracles related in the New Testament when we compare them with those found in this Gospel, the majority of its stories being tales of wonder of no higher moral worth than the prodigies of the Arabian Nights. But some of them are even malevolent miracles, such as it shocks us to read of as ascribed to our Blessed Lord. Boys who spill the water out of little ponds He had made for His play are cursed by Him, and thereon wither away; another boy who knocks up against Him in the street is in like manner cursed, and falls down dead. The accusers who complain to Joseph of the child's conduct are struck with blindness. The parents of one of the children whose death He has caused are quite reasonable in their complaint to Joseph: 'Take away that Jesus of thine from this place, for he cannot dwell with us in this town; or, at least, teach him to bless and not to curse.' The child likewise shows Himself from the first as omniscient as He is omnipotent. When He is brought to a master to be taught

His letters, and is bid to pronounce Aleph, He refuses to go on to Beth until the instructor has taught Him all the mysteries of Aleph; and on his failing to do this, the child not only shows that He knows all the letters, but teaches him mysteries with regard to the shape and powers of each, which fill the hearers with amazement. And in other stories He is made to show that He has no need of human instruction. These accounts may profitably be compared with Luke's statement, that Jesus increased in wisdom and knowledge; and with his narrative of our Lord sitting in the midst of the doctors, not for the purpose of teaching them, as these stories would have it, but 'hearing them, and asking them questions.'

This Gospel, however, can claim a very early parentage. The work, in the shape (or rather shapes) in which we now have it, has, no doubt, received many alterations and developments since the time of its first manufacture.* But at the beginning of the third century a Gospel bearing the name of St. Thomas was known both to Hippolytus and to Origen;† and Irenæus (I. xx.) refers to the story just mentioned, concerning the attempt to teach our Lord His letters, as a tale in circulation among heretics.‡ And this Gospel in its developed form obtained wide circulation in the East. From such a Gospel Mahomet seems to have drawn his conceptions of our Saviour (Renan, vi. 515).

In the Gospels which I have described, the public ministerial life of our Lord is avoided, and the inventors profess to give details of His life before He entered on His ministry. That to which I next come professes to supplement the Canonical Gospels at the other end. It has been current under

* According to the Stichometry of Nicephorus (see p. 178), it contained 1300 stichoi, which would correspond to a larger book than that we have; whence we may conclude that the parts most deeply tainted with heresy were cut out when the book was preserved for orthodox use. For instance, the words quoted by Hippolytus do not appear in our present text.

† Hippol. *Ref. Haer.* v. 7; Origen, *in Luc. Hom.* i.

‡ A coincidence with Justin Martyr has been pointed out. Justin (*Dial.* 88) states that our Lord, working as a carpenter, made ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, words which occur *Ev. Thom.* 13. But I am inclined to think that it was the pseudo-Evangelist who here borrowed from Justin, the latter being completely silent as to miracles performed by our Lord in His childhood, although in the chapter cited they could hardly fail to have been mentioned if they had been known to the writer.

the name of the Gospel of Nicodemus; but this name is modern, and criticism shows that the book is to be divided into two parts, of different dates and authorship. The first part gives a full account of the trial of our Lord, and it seems to be identical with what has been known under the name of the Acts of Pilate. Tischendorf has claimed for this part a very high antiquity. Justin Martyr twice refers his heathen readers (*Apol.* i. 35, 48, and probably 38), in confirmation of the things he tells concerning our Lord's death, to the Acts of Pilate, preserved in their own records. Tertullian does the same (*Apol.* 21). The best critics suppose that Justin Martyr did not himself know any such Acts of Pilate, but took for granted that he had sent his master an account of his doings, which would be sure to be found in the public records. But it is also possible that some Christian had already committed the pious fraud of fabricating Acts to answer this description, and that Justin Martyr was uncritical enough to be deceived by the fabrication. Tischendorf then thinks that this Gospel of which I speak contains the very Acts to which Justin refers; and the consequences in an apologetic point of view would be enormous. For these Acts are quite built up out of our four Canonical Gospels, including even the disputed verses at the end of St. Mark; St. John's Gospel being the one principally used. If, then, these Acts are as early as the first half of the second century, it would follow that all our Gospels are far earlier. But I do not think that Tischendorf's contention can be sustained, and cannot venture to claim greater antiquity than the fourth century for the Acts in their present form.* The latter part of what is known as the Gospel of Nicodemus contains an account of the descent of Christ to the under world. Two of the saints who were raised at His resurrection relate how they had been confined

* The statements for which the Acts of Pilate are appealed to by Justin and Tertullian are not to be found in the Gospel under consideration; nor is its form such as would be used by the composer of what were intended to pass for Roman official acts. On this subject see Lipsius *Die Pilatus-acten* and article 'GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL' in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. I consider that a limit in both directions to the age of this Gospel is given by its adoption of the date March 25 as that of the Saviour's Passion. This is quoted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 50), whence we may conclude that our Acts are earlier than A.D. 376; but the date itself,

in Hades when the Conqueror appeared at its entrance; how the gates of brass were broken and the prisoners released, Jesus taking with him to Paradise the souls of Adam, Isaiah, John the Baptist, and the other holy men who had died before Him. This story of a descent of our Lord to hell is of very great antiquity, and to it, no doubt, reference is made in that clause which in comparatively late times was added to the Creed. In the preaching of Thaddeus to Abgarus, of which I shall speak later on, part of the subject is said to have been how Jesus was crucified and descended into hell, and burst the bands which never had been broken, and rose again, and also raised with Himself the dead that had slept for ages; and how He had descended alone, but ascended with a great multitude to the Father. It may suffice to have said so much about Apocryphal Gospels of the supplemental class, if I merely add that these stories, though formally rejected by the Church, supplied abundant materials for legend, and are the source of many a name still current: Dismas and Gestas, the two robbers who were crucified with our Lord; Longinus, the soldier who pierced His side with a spear, or, according to some accounts, the centurion who superintended His crucifixion; Veronica, in some stories the woman who had the issue of blood, but, according to the popular tale, the woman who gave Him her handkerchief to wipe His face, and who received on it His true likeness.

In passing to the subject of heretical Gospels, I may just mention that a few evangelic fragments have been preserved, the source of which cannot be specified. For example, Justin Martyr,* Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus, all quote, as a saying of our Lord, 'In whatever things I find you, in these will I judge you;' but we do not know from what document they took the saying. The doctrine which it is intended

---

I cannot doubt, was first invented by Hippolytus in the early part of the third century. His whole system of chronology is based on an astronomical cycle, by means of which he imagined himself able to calculate the day of the Jewish Passover in any year; and, according to this cycle, March 25 would be the day in the year 29 which Hippolytus supposed to be the year of the Passion. But the cycle is worthless, and March 25 could not have been the Passover, or close to it, in that year.

* Justin, *Dial.* 47; Clem. Alex. *Quis dives*, 40; Hippol. *De Univers.*

to convey is that of Ezek. xviii., viz. that in the case alike of the wicked man who turns from his wickedness, or of the righteous man who turns from his righteousness, judgment will pass on the man according to the state in which death finds him. In the appendix to Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* you will find a complete list of the non-Canonical sayings ascribed to our Lord.

It would be easy to make a long list of the names of Gospels said to have been in use in different Gnostic sects; but very little is known as to their contents, and that little is not such as to lead us to attribute to them the very slightest historic value. The earliest heretical Gospel of which quotations are numerous is that 'according to the Egyptians,' the birthplace of which is probably truly indicated by its title, our knowledge of it being chiefly derived from Clement of Alexandria. Very soon after the rise of Christianity there came over the Western world a great wave of ascetic teaching from the East. If we can venture to trace a very obscure history, we may name India as the place where the movement originated. In that hot country very little food is absolutely necessary for the sustainment of life; and there were some who made it their glory to use as little as possible, and in other ways to detach themselves from that world of matter whence it was believed all evil had flowed. The admirers and imitators of these men by degrees spread themselves outside the limits of their own land. At any rate, whencesoever the teaching was derived, it became troublesome to the Christian Church in the very first years of its existence. Scarcely had St. Paul found himself able to relax his struggles against those who wanted to impose on his Gentile converts the yoke of circumcision and the Mosaic Law, when he was forced to do battle with a new set of opponents, whose cry was 'Touch not, taste not, handle not' (Col. ii. 21), who 'forbad to marry, and commanded to abstain from meats' (1 Tim. iv. 3). Several of the Gnostic sects had in common the feature of Encratism; that is to say, the rejection, as absolutely unlawful, of the use of marriage, of flesh meat, and of wine. Irenæus (i. 28) tells this of Saturninus, one of the earliest of the Gnostics. Their

principles obtained converts among heathens as well as among Christians: Porphyry, for instance, the great adversary of Christianity, has also a treatise (*De Abstinentia*) against the use of animal food. And even the Christians who refused to recognize Encratism as a binding rule were persuaded to acknowledge it to be a more perfect way of life. Among ourselves, for example, vegetarianism is regarded as a harmless eccentricity; but in early times of Christianity, even those who used animal food themselves came to think of the vegetarian as one who lived a higher life, and approached more nearly to Christian perfection. But it was the Encratite doctrine of the absolute unlawfulness of the marriage life which provoked the hottest controversies. The principal apocryphal Acts of the Apostles proceeded from men of Encratite views; and in these the type of story is of constant recurrence, how an Apostle persuades a young couple to abandon an intended project of matrimony; or how persecution is stirred up against the Christian missionaries by husbands whose wives these preachers have persuaded to desert them. The refutation of Encratism is the subject of the third book of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria; and this leads him to speak of the Gospel according to the Egyptians as a work in vogue in that sect, and to give some extracts from it. They contrast remarkably with the simplicity of the genuine utterances of our Lord. 'Salome said, "How long shall death prevail?" And He said, "As long as ye women bring forth." And she said, "Then did I well in not having children?" And He said, "Eat every herb, but eat not that which hath bitterness."' And again when Salome asked when the things about which she enquired should be known, and when His kingdom should come, He answered, 'When ye trample under foot the garment of shame, and when the two become one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female.'*

But I must not linger over heretical writings which have no bearing on modern controversies. I go on to speak of a

* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6 and 9; *Ex Scr. Theodot.* 67; Clem. Rom. so-called *Second Epistle*, 12. Notices of the Gospel according to the Egyptians are also found in Hippol. *Ref.* v. 7; Epiph. *Haer.* 62.

document by means of which it has been attempted, though with now confessed ill success, to establish the posteriority of two of our Canonical Gospels: I mean the Gospel of Marcion. Marcion, who came forward as a teacher about A.D. 140, is usually classed with the Gnostics; yet he deserves a place by himself, for he does not appear to have derived his heretical notions from these propagators of a medley of Christian, Jewish, and heathen ideas, but to have worked out his system for himself. As the son of a bishop, he had received a Christian education; but he was perplexed by that great problem of the origin of evil, which has been a puzzle to so many. He took, as his principle to start with, the Gospel maxim, 'A good tree cannot bring forth corrupt fruit.' It followed then, he concluded, that the Maker of the universe cannot be good. But the God of the Old Testament claims to be the Maker of the universe. This God also threatens to inflict punishment: in other words, to inflict suffering—to do evil. We must then believe in two Gods—the God of the Old Testament, a just God, the Creator, who alone was known to the Jews; and a good God, who was first revealed by Christ. For Christ Himself said, 'No man has known the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.' Marcion drew out in antitheses the contradictions which he imagined he found between the Old Testament and the New, and between the Old Testament and itself. But how was this disparagement of the Old Testament to be reconciled with the New Testament itself? In the first place, Marcion has to sacrifice all the original Apostles as unfaithful preachers of the truth. Paul alone is to be trusted, and even Paul must be expurgated. We have had examples in our modern 'tendency' critics of the Synoptic Gospels, that it is easy to establish that a document teaches anything you please if you are at liberty to cut out of it everything that contradicts your theory. So Marcion dealt with his Apostolicon, which consisted of ten Epistles of St. Paul. He had his Gospel also, with which he coupled no author's name, but which can be proved to be St. Luke's Gospel, with every part cut out which directly contradicted Marcion's theory. Tertullian devotes a whole book to Marcion's Gospel, going regularly through it,

and undertaking to show that the heretic can be refuted from his own Gospel. Epiphanius also notes at considerable length the differences between Marcion's Gospel and St. Luke's. And from these and other minor sources we can, with tolerable completeness, restore Marcion's Gospel.

Now, it happens in one or two cases that readings (not connected with Marcion's peculiar theory) which Tertullian reprobates as corruptions of Marcion's are still to be found in some of the oldest MSS. of the Gospels, and we have reason to think that in these cases Tertullian was in error in thinking his own copy right, and Marcion wrong.* Tertullian also blames Marcion for entitling Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians as to the Laodiceans; but it happens that in one or two of the oldest MSS. the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ̣ are absent from the address of that Epistle; and many critics think that Marcion was right, and that this was indeed the letter which the Colossians were directed by Paul to procure from Laodicea. Finally, Marcion is blamed by Tertullian for not including in his Apostolicon the three Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. But, as we shall find in another lecture, the sceptical school of the present day are of the same opinion, and gladly claim Marcion as a witness in their favour. So the theory suggests itself—it was only through ignorance and prejudice that Tertullian and other Fathers accused Marcion of mutilating the Gospels: they thought because his Gospel was shorter than theirs that he must have mutilated the Gospel; but the truth was, that he, living in the very beginning of the century at the end of which they lived, was in possession of the real original Gospel before it had been corrupted by additions. I have told you how it has been attempted to recover a

* Orthodox scribes would certainly not adopt readings invented by Marcion, so that any corrupt readings in which MSS. agree with Marcion must have crept into the text before his time. Now, in the newly-arrived volume of his *History of the N. T. Canon*, Zahn maintains (p. 675) that Marcion can be shown to have used a text of Luke corrupted by assimilation to Matthew and Mark; so that Marcion not only exhibits acquaintance with these Gospels, but also is proved to have lived at a time when the three Gospels had already circulated so long together that scribes had begun to be influenced in their copying of one by their habitual knowledge of the others. There has not been time for me to make an independent examination of Zahn's proofs, the full exhibition of which he has reserved for an Appendix not yet published.

Hebrew anti-Pauline Gospel by cutting out of St. Matthew everything that recognizes the calling of the Gentiles. That, after all, is unsatisfactory work, there being no means of verifying that such a Gospel as is thus arrived at was ever current. But it seems a fine thing to recover the opposition Gospel—a Pauline, anti-Jewish Gospel—and to have the evidence of Marcion that this was really current at the beginning of the second century. On this matter our sceptical opponents were left to puzzle out the matter for themselves with little help from the orthodox, who either took no notice of what seemed to them a wild theory, or else exclaimed against it without any detailed attempt to refute it. The falsity of the theory was exposed by persons very willing to believe in it; indeed the death-blow to the theory was given by Volkmar, whose name I have had occasion to mention to you in connexion with some very wild speculations. He and others reconstructed the Marcionite Gospel from the Patristic testimony, and comparing it with our St. Luke, asked themselves, Which has the greater claim to originality? It had to be borne in mind that Marcion's doctrine went far beyond Paul's: that while Paul contended against Jewish exclusiveness, and wished to put Gentiles on the same level, it is certain that he was not hostile to the Jews and their religion, in the way that Marcion was. Well, the result of examination was, that the features that distinguished Marcion's Gospel from our St. Luke were clearly not Pauline but Marcionite; and, on mere doctrinal grounds, these critics arrived at the conclusion that Marcion's Gospel was the mutilation, and not Luke's the amplification. Their arguments convinced their opponents, and the figment that Marcion's Gospel was the original St. Luke may now be regarded as, by the consent of all competent judges, quite exploded by criticism. The author of *Supernatural Religion*, however, thought proper to revive this moribund theory, and this led to a new examination of it by Dr. Sanday.* He took the passages which Marcion owned as belonging to the original Gospel, and minutely examined the style and the vocabulary, comparing

* See his *Gospels in the Second Century*. The chapter on Marcion had previously been published as an article in the *Fortnightly Review*.

them with the language of the passages which Marcion rejected; and the result was so decisive a proof of unity of authorship, that the author of *Supernatural Religion*, though not apt to confess defeat, has owned himself convinced, and has abandoned this part of his argument. But this abandonment is really an abandonment of great part of his book. For what is the use of contending that Justin Martyr and others who lived still later in the second century were ignorant of St. Luke's Gospel, if it has to be owned that Marcion, who wrote quite early in the century, was acquainted with that Gospel, and attached to it such value that he joined it with the Epistles of St. Paul, making it the basis of his entire system?

Before I part with Marcion I ought to notice another use that has been made of his attempt to make a new Gospel. The attempt to place Marcion before Luke may be regarded as having utterly collapsed; but it has been thought that ground might be gained for inferring that Marcion must have come before the fourth Gospel. It is said, Marcion's object was to get possession of a strong anti-Jewish, ultra-Pauline Gospel. The fact that he could do nothing better than take St. Luke's Gospel and modify it for his purpose by plentiful excisions shows, it has been said, that he knew nothing of St. John's Gospel, which would have exactly answered his purpose. But nothing can be more inconsiderate than this off-hand criticism. If St. John's Gospel can be called anti-Jewish, it is not so in the sense that Marcion is. It makes no opposition between the God of the Old Testament and that of the New; on the contrary, it so connects the two dispensations that Marcion would have found even more trouble necessary to adapt the fourth Gospel to his purpose than that which he has spent on the third. 'His own received Him not,' says St. John in the first few verses: that is to say, the Logos is identified with the God of the Jews, and claims that nation as His own people. The one verse (iv. 22) in the discourse with the woman of Samaria—'Salvation is of the Jews'—has been an insuperable stumbling-block to all critics who would exaggerate the anti-Jewish tendency of this Gospel. The Old Testament writers are appealed to as the best witnesses for Christ: 'Had ye believed Moses ye would have

believed me, for he wrote of me' (v. 46), 'Abraham rejoiced to see my day' (viii. 56), 'These things said Esaias when he saw his glory and spake of him' (xii. 41), 'Ye search the Scriptures and they are they which testify of me' (v. 39). The temple which the Jews had built for the worship of their God, Jesus claims as his Father's house: 'Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise' (ii. 16). The Old Testament is full of types of his work on earth: the brazen serpent (iii. 14), the manna in the wilderness (vi. 32), the Paschal Lamb (xix. 36). Great importance is attached to the testimony of John the Baptist, who, according to Marcion, like the older prophets, did not know the true Christ; and if there had been nothing else, the story of the miracle of turning water into wine would have condemned this Gospel in Marcion's eyes. We must also remember that to accept a Gospel ascribed to the Apostle John would have been at variance with the whole system of Marcion, who had thought himself warranted by Gal. ii. 14 to infer that the original Apostles did not walk 'uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel,' and therefore could not consistently use either the Gospels of Matthew or John, or that which was believed to have been derived from Peter (see Tert. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 3).

I own, then, that when I see one sceptical writer after another building an argument on the assumption that if Marcion had known the fourth Gospel he would have made it the text-book of his system, I cannot but ask myself, Which is it that these critics have never read—the Gospel of St. John, or the authorities which describe the system of Marcion? You will find that the fourth Gospel so swarms with recognitions of the identity of the God of the Jews with the Father of our Lord, and of the authority of the Old Testament writers as testifying to Him, that Marcion would have had work to do on every chapter before he could fit it to his purpose—a task which he was under no temptation to undertake, since, as we shall presently show, the fourth Gospel was never intended to stand alone, but was written for those who had an independent knowledge of the facts of our Saviour's life: so that no modification of the fourth Gospel would have enabled Marcion to dispense with another Gospel.

XII.

THE JOHANNINE BOOKS.

Part I.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I COME at length to consider the Fourth Gospel, which has been the subject of special assaults. In connexion with it I will discuss the other Johannine writings, the Epistles and the Apocalypse. I do not think it necessary to spend much time on the proofs that the First Epistle and the Gospel are the work of the same writer. There are numerous striking verbal coincidences between them, of which you will find a list in the introductions to the commentaries on the Epistle by the Bishop of Derry in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' and by Professor Westcott in a separate volume. I give only a few examples of phrases common to both: 'That your joy may be full' (*ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη*, 1 John i. 4; John xvi. 20): 'Walketh in darkness and knoweth not whither he goeth' (*ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, καὶ οὐκ οἶδε ποῦ ὑπάγει*, 1 John ii. 11; John xii. 35); 'Have passed from death unto life' (*μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν*, 1 John iii. 14; John v. 24); *γινώσκομεν τὸν ἀληθινόν* (1 John v. 24; John xvii. 3). Moreover, the Epistle gives to our Lord the titles 'only begotten' (iv. 9; John i. 14) and 'Saviour of the world' (iv. 14; John iv. 42, see also iii. 17). And remember that this phrase, 'Saviour of the world,' so familiar to us, conveyed an idea novel and startling to the Jewish mind of that day. I also take notice of the mention of 'the

water and the blood' in the Epistle (v. 6), which we can scarcely fail to connect with St. John's history of the Passion. But besides these, and several other, examples of phrases common to both works, there is such a general resemblance of style, thought, and expression, that critics of most opposite schools have agreed in recognizing common authorship.

I think, therefore, that it would be waste of time if I were to enumerate and answer the points of objection to this view made by Davidson and others of his school, whose work seems to me no more than laborious trifling. These microscopic critics forget that it is quite as uncritical to be blind to resemblances as it is to overlook points of difference. And there cannot be a more false canon of criticism than that a man who has written one work will, when writing a second, introduce no ideas and make use of no modes of expression that are not to be found in the first. On the contrary, a writer may be pronounced very barren indeed if he exhausts all his ideas and expends all his vocabulary on one production. I am sure that any unprejudiced judge would decide that while the minute points of difference that have been pointed out between the Gospel and the First Epistle are no more than must be expected in two productions of the same writer, the general resemblance is such, that a man must be devoid of all faculty of critical perception who cannot discern the proofs of common authorship.

The main reason for denying the common authorship is that, if it be granted, it demolishes certain theories about St. John's Gospel. For instance, one of the doctrines of the Tübingen school was, that the fourth Evangelist was so spiritual that he did not believe in a visible second coming of Christ: 'Instead of Christ's second coming we have the Spirit's mission to the disciples. Jesus comes again only in the Comforter. Future and present are comprehended in the one idea of eternal life whose possession is present. There is, therefore, no future judgment.' This doctrine about St. John is rather inconveniently pressed by the passage, John v. 28, 'The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man and shall come

forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.' Scholten coolly disposes of this troublesome passage by setting it down as an interpolation. It is equally necessary to reject the 21st chapter, which contains the words (*v.* 22), 'If I will that he tarry till I come.' At any rate the second coming is the sure hope of the Apostle when he wrote the Epistle. It is then 'the last time;' the disciples are exhorted to live so that they may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming (ii. 18, 28). Yet the Epistle uses just the same language as the Gospel about eternal life as a present possession: 'We have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.' In this, and in other instances which I need not detail to you, the arguments against the common authorship show only how ill-founded are the critic's theories about the doctrine of the Evangelist—theories chiefly founded on his not having said certain things, which, however, when he is allowed to speak for himself a little more, he does say.

As to the external history of the First Epistle, I merely mention that it is quoted by Polycarp (*c.* 7), by Papias (Euseb. III. 39), by Irenæus, III. xvi.,* and repeatedly by Clement of Alexandria (e. g. *Strom.* II. 15)† and Tertullian (e. g. *Adv. Prax.* 15; *De Pudic.* 19). In the Muratorian Fragment it is spoken of, not, in what it might seem its proper place, among the Epistles, but immediately in connexion with the Gospel (see the passage quoted, p. 48). When the list of Epistles is given, only two of St. John are mentioned. The fact that in this document the First Epistle is detached from the other two and connected with the Gospel is ably made use of by Bishop Lightfoot (*Contemporary Review*, October, 1875, p. 835), in confirmation of a

* The language of Irenæus suggests that he read the Second Epistle as if it were part of the First. In the passage here referred to, he introduces his quotation with the words 'Johannes in epistola sua,' as if he knew but one. A little further on he quotes a passage from the Second Epistle with the words 'in praedicta epistola.' He had also quoted the Second Epistle, I. xvi.

† The form of quotation ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ implies also an acknowledgment of the Second Epistle.

theory of his, that the First Epistle was originally published with the Gospel as a kind of commendatory postcript.*

Augustine, followed by other Latin authorities, calls this the Epistle to the Parthians (*Quaest. Evangel.* II. 39). It has been conjectured that this may have been a corruption of a Greek title πρὸς παρθένους. The ground is not very conclusive, namely, that Clement of Alexandria tells us (*Hypotyp.* p. 1011, Potter's edition) that the *Second* Epistle of St. John was known under this title. Gieseler plausibly conjectures that in both cases a corruption took place of the title τοῦ παρθένου, which was commonly given to John in early times, and which may have been added to the inscriptions of the Epistles.

The fourth Gospel, as I have said, has been the subject of far more serious assaults than the others. If the others are allowed to have been published soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, the fourth is not assigned an earlier date than the latter half of the second century. Such, at least, was Baur's theory; but in the critical sifting it has undergone, the date of the fourth Gospel has been receding further and further back in the second century, so that now hardly any critic with any pretension to fairness puts it later than the very beginning of that century, if not the end of the first century, which comes very close to the date assigned it by those who believe in the Johannine authorship.

In the value he attaches to the fourth Gospel, Renan is a singular exception among sceptical writers. He is ready enough to grant the antiquity of our documents, though claiming for himself an intuitive sagacity which can discriminate the true words and actions of Jesus from what may have been added by the piety of the second generation of Christians. To St. John's Gospel Renan attaches particular value. The discourses, indeed, of Jesus, recorded by St. John, are not to Renan's taste, and he rejects them with depreciating epithets which I need not repeat; but the account given of the life of Jesus he treats as preferable, in a multitude of

* On the attestation borne by the First Epistle to the Gospel, it is particularly worth while to consult Hug's *Introduction*, II. 245.

cases, to the narrative of the Synoptic Evangelists. In particular he declares that the last month of the life of Jesus can only be explained by St. John, and that a multitude of traits unintelligible in the Synoptic Gospels assume in St. John's narrative consistency and probability. He is the more ready to attribute this Gospel to St. John because he imagines that he finds in it a design unduly to exalt that Apostle, and to show that on different occasions he was honoured by Jesus with the first place. His theory is, that John in his old age having read the evangelic narratives then in circulation, remarked in them several inaccuracies, and was besides annoyed at finding that only a secondary place in the history of Christ was assigned to himself; that he then began to dictate a multitude of things which he knew better than the others, and with the intention of showing that on many occasions where Peter alone was spoken of in those narratives, he had figured with him and before him. These precious notes Renan supposes to have been distorted by the mistakes or carelessness of John's disciples. In order to reconcile his belief in the antiquity of the Gospels with his rejection of their historic authority, whenever it is convenient for him to do so, Renan imagines a case of a life and recollections of Napoleon written separately by three or four soldiers of the Empire thirty or forty years after the death of their chief. It is clear, he says, their narratives would present numerous errors and contradictions: one would put Wagram before Marengo; another would write without hesitation that Napoleon turned out the government of Robespierre; a third would omit expeditions of the highest importance. But one thing would stand out clearly in these artless notes, and that is, the character of the hero and the impression he made on those about him. And in this point of view such popular histories would be worth far more than a formal and official one.

But in this comparison one point of essential difference is overlooked. Three or four soldiers of the Empire would be competent witnesses to such facts as lay within their range of observation. They would be incompetent witnesses to the order and design of battles, changes of ministry, plans of

statesmanship, and other things out of their sphere. If they meddled with such matters in their stories we should not be surprised to find errors and contradictions. But to have a real comparison to lives of our Lord written by Apostles, we should imagine lives of Napoleon written by three or four of his marshals. In that case a statement concerning his battles in which all agreed would justly be regarded as of the highest authority. Take the account of any of our Lord's miracles, and especially that of the Resurrection. We ask, Is the narrator telling a wilful lie? 'No' is answered by almost all our antagonists. Well, then, could he be mistaken? 'Yes,' answer Strauss and his school. 'He lived a long time after the event, and only honestly repeated the stories which had then got into circulation about the founder of his religion.' But if we admit, as Renan in his first edition was willing to do, that the Gospel is the work of an Apostle and an eye-witness, the possibility of a mistake can no longer be asserted with any plausibility. I think, therefore, that Renan's reviewers of the sceptical school were quite right in regarding him as having made a most dangerous concession in admitting that John's Gospel has the authority of the Apostle of that name. The authority, I say, for Renan does not now at least maintain that it was actually written by John himself, but rather that it was the work of a disciple who bore to John the same relation which, according to Papias, Mark bore to Peter.

It remains for us, therefore, to examine the arguments which are urged against the Johannine authorship. Now, with respect to external evidence, I have already expressed my belief that John's Gospel stands on quite as high a level of authority as any of the others. Suffice it now to say that if it be a forgery it has had the most wonderful success ever forgery had; at once received not only by the orthodox, but by the most discordant heretics—by Judaizing Christians, Gnostics, Mystics—all of whom owned the necessity of reconciling their speculations with the sayings of this Gospel.

Of the reasons why its apostolic origin has been disbelieved, I will place first that which I believe to have had the greatest influence, and to have been the cause why other

reasons have been sought for, namely, the impossibility of reconciling the Gospel with the denial of our Lord's Divinity. Critics now-a-days trust far more to their own powers of divination than to historical testimony. It is an assumed principle with them that there can be no miracle; that Jesus was a man like others; that he must have been so regarded by his disciples; that the opinion that he was more than man could only have gradually grown up; that, therefore, a book in which the doctrine of Christ's Divinity is highly developed bears on the face of it the marks of late date. This is a prepossession against which it is hard to struggle; the forms of scientific inquiry may be gone through, but the sentence has been passed before the evidence has been looked at. Whatever be the pretext on which the book is condemned, the real secret of the hostility to it is the assumption that a belief in our Lord's Godhead could not have existed among the Apostles who had companied with Him during His life, and that it must have grown up by degrees among the new generation of Christians who had not known our Lord after the flesh, and who merely reverenced in their ideal Christ a personification of all that is pure and noble in humanity. St. John's Gospel, if admitted as of authority, would make Christ from the first claim and receive a homage to which no mere man is entitled. There was a time when Socinians endeavoured to reconcile their system with the evangelical records, but that attempt is now abandoned as hopeless, and accordingly, the overthrow of at least St. John's Gospel becomes a necessity.

Strauss, on whose principles the question whether Jesus was more than man cannot even claim discussion, argues that 'Jesus in John's Gospel claims to have a recollection of a divine existence reaching back to a period before the creation of the world. Such a recollection is inconceivable to us, because in accredited history no instance of it has occurred. If anyone should speak of having such a recollection, we should consider him as a fool or an impostor. But since it is difficult to believe that Jesus was either of these, we cannot allow that the words attributed to him were really spoken by him.' Similarly Strauss is offended with the whole tone of

the language of Jesus about Himself, as reported in this Gospel, the manner in which He insists on His divinity, puts His own person forward, and makes adherence to Himself the first duty of His disciples. 'The speeches of Jesus about himself in this Gospel,' says Strauss, 'are an uninterrupted doxology only translated out of the second person into the first, from the form of address to another into an utterance about a self. When an enthusiastic disciple calls his master (supposed to have been raised to heaven) the light of the world—when he says of him that he who has seen him has seen the Father, that he is God Himself, we excuse the faithful worshipper such extravagances. But when he goes so far as the fourth Evangelist, and puts the utterances of his own pious enthusiasm into the mouth of Jesus, in the form of Jesus's utterances about himself, he does him a very perilous service.'

I admit it; a very perilous service if Jesus be no more than man. Assuredly, in that case, we cannot admire him as a faultless man. We must regard him, to speak the plain truth, as one who, however excellent, disfigured his real merits by his own exaggerated pretensions, who habitually used inflated if not blasphemous language respecting the dignity of his own person: such language, in short, as naturally led to the consequence that he, though man, came to be worshipped as God. However, the question with which we are immediately concerned is not whether Jesus possessed superhuman power and authority, but whether He claimed it. The self-assertion of Jesus in the fourth Gospel can reasonably be made a plea for discrediting the authority of the writer, only if it can be made out that such language on our Lord's part is inconsistent with what is elsewhere told of Him. And this is what is asserted. It is said that in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is only a moral reformer, anxious to give to the commands of the law their highest spiritual meaning, and rejecting the evasions by which a compliance with their letter was made to excuse a breach of their spirit. In the fourth Gospel, on the contrary, Jesus puts forward Himself. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the only door by which man can have access to God.

We may freely own that John's Gospel gives greater prominence to this class of our Lord's utterances, but we deny that they are at all inconsistent with what is attributed to Him in the Synoptic Gospels. On the contrary, the dignity of the Saviour's person, and the duty of adhering to Him, are as strongly stated in the discourses which Matthew puts into his mouth as in any later Gospel: 'Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven; Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven; 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me' (x. 32, 33, 40). 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls;' 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him' (xi. 27, 28, 29). Again, His present glory and power is expressed in the promises: 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;' 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world' (xxviii. 18, 20). 'I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist (Luke xxi. 15). But it is a small matter to prove that our Lord promised that after His departure from the world he should continue to be to His disciples an ever-present and powerful protector. What he declared concerning His second coming more decisively marks Him out as one who claimed to stand on a different level from ordinary men. St. Matthew represents Him as telling that all the tribes of the earth shall 'see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and that he shall send *his* angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other' (xxiv. 30). He goes on to tell (xxv. 31) how all nations shall be gathered before Him while He sits on the throne of His glory and pronounces judgment upon them; and the judgment is to be determined

according to the kindness they shall have shown to Himself. The Synoptic Evangelists all agree in representing Jesus as persisting in this claim to the end, and as finally incurring condemnation for blasphemy from the high-priest and the Jewish Council, because, in answer to a solemn adjuration, He professed Himself to be that Son of Man who was one day to come in the clouds of heaven, as Daniel had prophesied (Matt. xxvii. 65; Mark xiv. 62; see also Luke xxii. 66). Now, reflect for a moment what we should think of one who declared his belief that on that great day, when mankind shall stand before the judgment-seat of God, he should not stand like others, to give account of the deeds done in the body, but be seated on the throne of judgment, passing sentence on the rest of the human race. If we could think of him as, after all, no more than a man like ourselves, we must set him down as, in the words of Strauss, either a fool or an impostor. We can only avoid forming such a judgment of Jesus by believing Him to be in real truth more than man. It follows that the claims which the Synoptic Gospels represent our Lord as making for Himself are so high, and, if He was really mere man, are so extravagant, that if we accept the Synoptic Gospels as truly representing the character of our Lord's language about Himself, we certainly have no right to reject St. John's account, on the score that it puts too exalted language about Himself into the mouth of our Lord.

If it is objected that the ascription of such language to Jesus belongs to a later stage of Christian thought, and that they who had known their Master after the flesh could not have held the high views concerning His Person which this ascription implies, we can easily show that, in works of earlier date than anyone has claimed for the fourth Gospel, no lower view is expressed of the dignity of our Lord. I have already said (p. 25) that Baur acknowledged the Apocalypse to have been written by St. John; and the same view is taken by Renan and by many other critics of the same school, who draw from their acknowledgment of the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse their strongest argument against that of the fourth Gospel; for they hold it to be one of the most certain conclusions of critical science that the

two books could not have had the same author. But other critics of the same school have been clear-sighted enough to perceive that the acknowledgment of the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse necessitates the abandonment of the argument we have just been considering. For the dignity ascribed to our Lord in the Book of Revelation is such that it requires some ingenuity to make out that the Gospel attributes to Him any higher. All through the Revelation Jesus plainly holds a position far above that of any created being. He is described as 'the beginning of the creation of God' (iii. 14). He sits on the throne of the Father of all (iii. 21). He is the object of worship of every created thing which is in the heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all things that are in them (v. 13). His blood has been an atonement which sufficed to purchase to God men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation (v. 9). He is King of kings and Lord of lords (xix. 16).

When I was speaking of the lofty claims which our Lord, as reported by the Synoptic Evangelists, made for Himself, I omitted to mention one illustration. Those who wished to do Him honour are related to have saluted Him as Son of David (Matt. xx. 30; xxi. 9): the Jewish rulers, who saw all that was implied by such a title, and feared the fatal consequences to their nation which would follow from an attempt to restore David's earthly kingdom, hoped that the Galilean prophet would disclaim so perilous an honour, and asked Him to rebuke His disciples (xxi. 15). He not only accepted the honours offered Him, as so plainly His due, that if His disciples were to hold their peace the very stones would cry out; but He went on to intimate that the title Son of David was less than He could rightfully claim, and He pointed out that the Messiah was described in the Book of Psalms as David's Lord (xxii. 43). I am disposed to connect with this the words ascribed to our Lord in the Apocalypse (xxii. 16): 'I am the *root* and the offspring of David.' It is possible to give the word ῥίζα the secondary meaning, 'scion' (having regard to Isa. xi. 10; Rom. xv. 12; Rev. v. 5); yet I prefer to give it the meaning 'root,' which implies existence prior to David, because the idea of priority is unmistakeably

expressed in other passages. There is one passage in particular where the antecedence to all created things of Him who in the Revelation is called the Word of God is expressed in such a way as not to fall short of an ascription to Him of the titles and prerogatives of the Supreme God. Whom but the Supreme God should we imagine to be speaking when we read (i. 8): 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty'? Read on a little way (*v.* 17), and we find One who is unmistakeably our blessed Lord addressing the Apocalyptic seer with like words, which are again repeated (xxii. 13), 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.' The fourth Gospel puts into the mouth of our Lord no claim of Godhead stronger or more express than what the glorified Saviour is represented as uttering in the Book of the Revelation. And this ascription to Him of glory not distinguished from that of the Supreme is a prevailing characteristic of the book. The Son of God sits down with His Father in His throne (iii. 21); and this throne is called, 'the throne of God and of the Lamb; (xxii. 1, 3; cf. xx. 6). The doctrine of the Gospel (v. 23) that 'all should honour the Son even as they honour the Father' is deeply stamped on the Apocalypse.

To some critics it has seemed incredible that one who had known Jesus, and conversed with Him as a man like himself, should pay Him divine honours such as it was natural enough for enthusiastic disciples to render, in whose eyes the Founder of their religion was but an ideal Personage. On that account they have refused to believe that the fourth Evangelist can be one who had been a personal companion of our Lord. But here we find that the Gospel presents no more exalted conception of the Saviour's dignity than that which is offered in the Book of the Revelation, the apostolic authorship of which so many critics of all schools are willing to acknowledge.* In confirmation of the view that the Apocalypse was written by a personal hearer of our Lord, I may notice that

* See, for example, the passages cited from Baur and Zeller by Archdeacon Lee, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 406.

echoes of the Gospel records of the words of Jesus are to be found more frequently in this than in any other New Testament book, except perhaps the Epistle of James.* And I cannot help thinking that we should find still more coincidences if we had a fuller record of the words of Jesus than that preserved in the Gospels. Thus St. James (i. 12) refers to our Lord's promise of a 'crown of life,' and Zeller hence drew a proof (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 93) that the author of that Epistle used the Apocalypse, Rev. ii. 10 being the only New Testament place where such a promise is put into the mouth of our Lord. But it seems to me much more probable that we have here reminiscences by two independent hearers, James and John, of words actually spoken by our Lord, of which traces are also to be found, 2 Tim. iv. 8, 1 Pet. v. 4.

Again, when the prominence given to the doctrines of our Lord's divinity and pre-existence is made a ground for assigning a late date to the fourth Gospel, we must remember that these doctrines are taught in documents earlier than either Gospel or Apocalypse—I mean St. Paul's Epistles. I refer in particular to the passage in the Epistle to the Colossians (i. 15–18), which is quite as strong as the prologue to St. John. Christ is there the 'image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist; and he is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence.' Baur very consistently refuses to believe that this was written by St. Paul: but most critics, even of the sceptical school, have owned that the evidence for the genuineness of the Epistle to the Colossians is too strong to be resisted, especially connected as it is with the Epistle to Philemon, which bears an unmistakeable stamp of truth, and which is utterly beyond the invention of any forger.

* For example:—i. 7, Matt. xxiv. 30; ii. 7, Matt. xi. 15, &c.: ii. 23, Matt. xvi. 27; ii. 26, Matt. xxiv. 13; iii. 3, Matt. xxiv. 42; iii. 5, Matt. x. 32

In this connexion I have pleasure in referring to an excellent comparison of the theology of St. John with that of St. Paul by Mr. J. J. Murphy (*Scientific Bases of Faith*, p. 365), where he founds an argument for the truth of their doctrine on the coincidence of two independent witnesses. Both are found to express the same doctrines, but in quite different language; whereas if the fourth Gospel had been indebted to St. Paul we should have found there some of St. Paul's expressions as well as his doctrine.*

I have devoted so much time to the objection brought against the fourth Gospel from the character of its Christology, because, though not really the strongest, it is, I believe, the most influential; and the reason why other arguments have been sought for is the fear that the reception of the fourth Gospel would give apostolic authority to a view of our Lord's person which the objectors are determined to reject. I consider that I have shown that this view was at least that accepted among Christians several years before the date claimed either for Gospel or Apocalypse; and that I have shown also that though the fourth Gospel may give greater prominence than do the preceding three to those utterances of our Lord in which He asserts His own superhuman character, there is nothing in such utterances unlike

---

* Compare the teaching of each of the Apostles on the Deity of Christ (John i. 1, iii. 13, xx. 28; Rom. ix. 5, Phil. ii. 6); his pre-existence (John vi. 62, viii. 58, xvii. 5; Col. i. 17); his work of creation (John i. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i. 16); the association of his name with that of God on terms of equality (John v. 18, 23, xiv. 10, 23, xvii. 3, 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Gal. i. 1; Eph. v. 5, 1 Thess. iii. 11); the voluntariness of his humiliation (John x. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 7); his present power and glory (John iii. 35, xiv. 14; Rom. xiv. 9, 1 Cor. xv. 25, Eph. i. 20, Phil. ii. 10); that by him only access is had to the Father (John xiv. 6; Eph. ii. 18, 1 Tim. ii. 5); that by faith in him we are justified (John iii. 15, vi. 47, xi. 25, xx. 31; Rom. iii. 22, v. 1, Gal. ii. 16, Eph. ii. 8); that atonement has been made by him (John i. 29, vi. 51, 1 John i. 7, ii. 2, iii. 5; Rom. iii. 24, v. 9, 1 Cor. v. 7, Gal. iii. 13, Eph. i. 7); that his life is the source of his people's life (John vi. 53; Rom. v. 10); that they are united with him (John xv. 5: 1 John ii. 5, iii. 6, iv. 13; Rom. viii. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 5, Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27); that our relation to him is like his relation to the Father (John x. 14, 15, xiv. 20, xv. 9: 1 Cor. iii. 22): on all these points you will find a wonderful similarity of substantial doctrine with great variety of expression. The two witnesses are clearly independent, and their teaching is the same: see also Lias's *Doctrinal System of St. John*.

what is found in every report of the language which He habitually used.*

* At the very time when the first edition of these lectures was published, the Hibbert Lectures were delivered in London, by Dr. Pfleiderer, Professor of Theology at Berlin, a pupil of Baur's, but who has retired from some of his master's extreme positions. Pfleiderer still maintains the anti-Paulinism of the Apocalypse, but he is in perfect agreement with what I had said as to the identity of the Christology of the book with that of Paul; and as to the impossibility of denying the Johannine origin of the Gospel, on account of its Christology, without on the same ground denying that of the Apocalypse. I cannot forbear quoting at length:—

'Like the Pauline Christology, that of the author of the Apocalypse hinges on the one hand on the expiatory death, and on the other on the celestial glory of Christ, whilst the earthly life of Jesus is referred to only so far that Christ is called the "Offspring of David" and the "Lion of Juda;" just as Paul in the Epistle to the Romans had connected Christ's descent from David with his Divine Sonship. As Paul denominated Christ the Passover slain for us, so our author likes to describe him as "the Lamb slain for us," and finds in his violent death a proof of his love for us and an expiation to purify us from the guilt of sin, a ransom to redeem us to God. Again, as Paul calls Christ the first fruits of them that slept, so in the Apocalypse we find him termed the first-born from the dead. As, according to Paul, Christ has been exalted to the regal dignity of divine dominion over all, so, according to our author, he has taken his seat on the throne by the side of his Father, participating therefore in his divine dominion and power; he is the Lord of the churches, holds their stars, or guardian angels, in his hand, and is also Ruler of nations and King of kings, the all-wise and almighty Judge of the nations; indeed, to him is due a worship similar to that of God himself. As the author of the Apocalypse in his apotheosis of Christ as an object of worship thus almost outstrips Paul, neither does he in his dogmatic definitions of Christ's nature at all fall behind the Apostle. Like Paul, he calls Christ the "Son of God" in the metaphysical sense of a god-like spiritual being, and far beyond the merely theocratic significance of the title. As Paul had said, 'The Lord is the Spirit,' so our author identifies Christ with the Spirit, or celestial principle of revelation which speaks to the Churches and rules in them. As Paul had had a vision of Christ as the Man from heaven in celestial light and glory, so the author of the Apocalypse likewise beholds Him in a super-mundane form like unto a son of man, his face shining as the sun. As Paul had described the celestial Son of Man as at the same time the image of God, the agent of creation, the head of every man, and finally even God over all, so the Christ of the Apocalypse introduces Himself with the predicates of Divine majesty, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the All-powerful;" and He is accordingly called also "the Head of creation," and "the Word of God," that is, the mediating instrument of all Divine revelation from the creation of the world to the final judgment.

'It appears from this that the similarity of the Christology of the Apocalypse to that of Paul is complete; this Christ occupies the same exalted position as the Pauline Christ above the terrestrial Son of Man. Would such a view of Christ be conceivable in the case of a man who had lived in personal intercourse with Jesus? I think we have in this another proof that the author of the Apocalypse was not the Apostle John.'—Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 158–161.

XIII.

Part II.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE APOCALYPSE.

I come now to discuss the objection that is most relied on, and to which I have already referred, that the Apocalypse and the fourth Gospel are so different in style and character that it is impossible to believe they can have been written by the same person; and that since John the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse he could not have written the Gospel. This argument is borrowed from Dionysius of Alexandria, who lived in the third century, and who made the converse use of it, namely, that as John wrote the Gospel he could not have written the Apocalypse. And certainly, if we had to assign to the Apostle but one of the two, and were only guided by external evidence, we should have more reason to assign him the Gospel. The only point of advantage for the Apocalypse is that Justin Martyr happens to name the Apostle John as its author, while he uses the Gospel without mention of the Evangelist's name. On the other hand, the proof of early acknowledgment, by heretics as well as by orthodox, is rather stronger for the Gospel (see p. 58); and the reception of the Gospel in the Church was unanimous, which is more than we can say for the Apocalypse.

However, in either case, the external evidence is amply sufficient. For the Apocalypse, in addition to Justin, I could quote Papias and quite a long list of second-century witnesses to its recognition in the Church (see Westcott, *N. T. Canon*, Index, p. 587). I content myself with appealing to Irenæus, whose testimony to the four Gospels has been already produced (p. 37). He is equally strong in his witness to the Apocalypse. A remarkable passage is one (v. 30) in which he discusses whether the true reading of the number of the Beast is 666 or 616, both readings being found in MSS. of his time, as they are still.* Irenæus declares that the reading

* 616 is the reading of Codd. C, 11.

666 is that of the best and oldest copies, and is attested by those who had seen John face to face. We cannot but be struck by this mention of a traditional knowledge of the prophecy concurrent with the evidence of the written copies. The estimation in which Irenæus held the book is evidenced by the sense he expresses of the guilt and penalty incurred by those who substituted the erroneous number for the true, though he trusts that those may obtain pardon whose adoption of the error was not wilful. The denunciation (Rev. xxii. 18, 19) had previously been clearly referred to by Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb. iv. 23). Irenæus gives examples of Greek names the arithmetical value of the sum of whose letters amounts to 666 (εὐανθάς, λατεῖνος, τειτάν), but he does not venture to express a confident decision in favour of any solution; because he looks on the Apostle as having designedly left the matter obscure, since if he had wished the name to be known at the time he would have spoken plainly. And whatever reasons there were for hiding the name at the first must still exist in the time of Irenæus. 'For it was not long ago that the vision was seen, but almost in our own generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian.' I shall presently return to speak of the statement here made as to the date of the book. The Muratorian Fragment twice refers to the Apocalypse. In speaking of Paul's Epistles the writer says that Paul had written letters to seven Churches, following the order of his predecessor John, who in the Apocalypse had written to seven Churches. Further on he says: 'We receive only the Revelations of John and of Peter, the latter of which some of us will not have read in the Church.' Of this Apocalypse of Peter I must take another opportunity to speak.

We may assume, then, that in the time of Irenæus the Apocalypse was commonly received, and that on it were founded the expectations that generally prevailed of a personal reign of our Lord on earth for a thousand years. But these expectations soon assumed a very gross and carnal character. I will quote the tradition which Irenæus (v. 33) cites from Papias, a tradition which consoles us for the loss we have sustained of the work in which Papias collected

unwritten records of the Saviour's teaching, and which probably was one of the causes which moved Eusebius (iii. 39) to pronounce Papias a man of weak understanding. 'The elders who saw John, the disciple of our Lord, remembered to have heard from him that our Lord taught and said: The days shall come in which vines shall grow, each having 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 twigs, and on each twig 10,000 clusters, and on each cluster 10,000 grapes; and each grape when pressed shall yield 25 measures of wine; and when any of the saints shall have taken hold of one of these clusters another shall say: I am a better cluster; take me and bless the Lord through me. Likewise, also, a grain of wheat shall produce 10,000 ears, and every ear 10,000 grains, and every grain ten pounds of pure white meal, and the other fruits, seeds, and vegetables in like manner. And all the animals using the food thus yielded by the earth shall be peaceful and agree together, and be subject to man with all subjection. . . . And He added: These things are credible to believers. And when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked Him, How shall such growth be accomplished? the Lord said: They shall see who come to those times.'*

This is a specimen of the kind of notions which were current under the name of Chiliasm; and spiritual men were shocked at seeing their Christian brethren looking forward to a kind of Mahometan paradise, the chief enjoyment of which was to consist of the pleasures of sense, not excluding those of the grossest kind. Hence arose a strong reaction against Millennarian ideas, and hence also a disposition to reject the inspiration of the book on which the Millennarians mainly

* Great light has been cast on the probable source of this tradition of Papias through the publication from the Syriac, by Ceriani (Milan, 1866), of a Jewish book called the Apocalypse of Baruch. It is included in Fritzsche's 'Apocryphal books of the Old Testament' (Leipzig, 1871). Fritzsche judges the book to have been written not long after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. The book contains (c. 29) a description of the times of the Messiah, in which it is predicted that a vine shall have 1000 shoots, each shoot 1000 clusters, each cluster 1000 grapes, and each grape shall yield a measure of wine. It is reasonable to think that this book furnished the original of the story, which, before it reached Papias, had been considerably improved, and had come to be referred to a saying of our Lord.

relied. In the beginning of the third century Caius, of whom I spoke in a former lecture, ascribed the book to the heretic Cerinthus. The proof of this had not been complete, but the matter has lately been put beyond doubt.

Dionysius of Alexandria, whose criticism on the Book of Revelation I am about to quote presently, begins it by saying that some of his predecessors had utterly rejected this book, criticizing every chapter, pronouncing it to be unintelligible and inconsistent, and declaring that the title, 'Revelation of John' was doubly false. For they said that a book so obscure did not deserve to be called a revelation, and that the author, far from being an Apostle, was not even a member of the Church, but was Cerinthus, the founder of the Cerinthian heresy: whose doctrine was that the kingdom of Christ should be earthly. For being a carnal and sensual man, he dreamed that its enjoyments would consist in those grosser bodily pleasures which he himself coveted, and, for a decorous cover to these, feastings and sacrifices, and slaughters of victims (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25). Scholars had combined this statement of Dionysius with an extract given by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 28), from the dialogue of Caius against the Montanists. In this passage, Caius rejects a book of revelations purporting to have been written by a great apostle, and containing an account of miraculous communications made to him by angels. Caius ascribes the real authorship of the book to Cerinthus, and states that these spurious revelations taught that after the Resurrection the kingdom of Christ should be earthly; that the flesh of the risen saints should again be enslaved to lusts and pleasures; that they should inhabit Jerusalem, and should spend a thousand years in marriage festivities.

Some critics inferred from coincidences of expression that Caius was the writer referred to by Dionysius; but it was urged, on the other hand, that Eusebius gives no hint that Caius was speaking of the book which we know as the Revelation of St. John; that that book does not expressly claim to be written by an Apostle; that it nowhere describes millennial happiness as consisting in sensual gratifications; and that Caius shows no consciousness that he was express-

ing an opinion different from that of the Roman Church of his time, which, as we know from the Muratorian Fragment, and from Hippolytus, accepted the Book of the Apocalypse as Johannine. But the question has recently been set at rest through the bringing to light* of a work in which the Syriac writer Bar Salibi, whom I have already had occasion to mention (p. 84), quotes some of the criticisms of Caius on the Apocalypse, together with replies to them by Hippolytus. And from the specimens given by Bar Salibi it seems to me that the character of the work of Caius, from which he quotes, must have exactly answered to the description of Dionysius, viz. that it must have gone systematically through the book of the Revelation, criticizing it in detail, so that there is reason to conclude that Caius was the author to whom Dionysius referred.

We hear of opposition to the book by no one else in the West; but in the East its authority decayed. It is not included in the Peshitto Syriac,† and Jerome tells us that the Greeks of his time did not receive it (*Ep.* 129, *ad Dard.*). Eusebius speaks doubtfully about it, and seems divided between his own judgment, formed from the contents of the book, which inclined him to reject it, and the weight of external evidence in its favour, which he found it hard to set aside. He consequently shrinks from expressing his own opinion, and tries to cast on his readers the responsibility of forming a judgment (*H. E.* iii. 25, 39). Towards the end of the fourth century there were a few, of whom we are told by Epiphanius and Philaster (*Haer.* 60), who ascribed both Gospel and Apocalypse to Cerinthus. Epiphanius calls them Alogi; but it is a mistake to suppose that there was a sect of heretics of the name. This was only a clever nickname invented by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51, 3) for the opponents of the Logos

* This was done by Dr. Gwynn, *Hermathena*, 1888. The work of Bar Salibi is in MS. in the British Museum, and it would seem that no Syriac scholar had previously read enough of it to find these interesting quotations from Caius.

† Yet we find Theophilus of Antioch using the book before the end of the second century (Euseb. iv. 24). Ephraem Syrus cites Rev. v. 1–3 (*Serm. Exeg. in Ps.* cxl. 3. Opp. Syr. ii. 332).

Gospel, the word being intended to denote the irrational character of their opposition. I do not know that there were ever enough of them to make a sect;* and they seem unworthy of notice, since their objections as reported by Epiphanius do not profess to have rested on any grounds of external testimony. Their ascribing the Gospel to Cerinthus shows that they believed in its antiquity, since Cerinthus was contemporary with St. John. This report of the evidence justifies me in saying that if we were compelled to abandon one or other, we should have far more countenance from antiquity for ascribing the Gospel to St. John than for attributing to him the Book of Revelation. At the same time I regard the evidence for the latter as amply sufficient, because the testimony in its favour is a century or two earlier than the doubts which arose concerning it, and which seem to have arisen entirely from unwillingness to accept the doctrine of a future reign of our Lord on this earth.

I wish now to state a little more fully the argument of Dionysius of Alexandria, because it is an interesting specimen

---

* In fact I now believe that 'the Alogi' consisted of Caius, and, as far as I can learn, nobody else. I have already said (p. 168) with what caution we are obliged to receive the statements of Epiphanius. Lipsius in the work quoted (note, p. 148) has endeavoured to ascertain from what authorities the statements in his treatise against heresies were derived, with the result of finding that what may be called the basis of the work was a treatise against heresies composed at the beginning of the third century by Hippolytus, which Epiphanius, rather more than 150 years afterwards, enlarged by adding to the thirty-two heresies with which it dealt notices of some which had appeared in the meantime, and others which he conceived that his own research had discovered. The work of Hippolytus is lost; but we know it through independent use made of it by Philaster, a contemporary of Epiphanius, and through a list of heresies erroneously included among the works of Tertullian, which was derived from the same source. We know now for certain that in what Epiphanius says, in refutation of the opponents of the Apocalypse, he was drawing from Hippolytus; for one objection and reply are the same as those which Dr. Gwynn has recovered as part of the controversy between Caius and Hippolytus. There is a question, however, whether Epiphanius took his section from the treatise against the thirty-two heresies, or from some other work of Hippolytus, among whose lost writings was one bearing the title, 'In defence of the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John,' which, in all probability, was the book written in controversy with Caius. But in any case we have reason to think that Hippolytus treated his opponent's opinion as heresy; for the Syriac fragments speak of him as the 'heretic Caius.'

There is no reason to think that Epiphanius knew anything more about

of an early application of critical science to discriminate the claims of different books ascribed to the same author. Dionysius was bishop of Alexandria from 247 to 265, and had been the successor of Origen as president of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. Origen had acknowledged the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John, and, by his favourite method of allegorical interpretation, had got over the difficulties which the literal acceptance of its doctrines might have occasioned. But the mass of simple believers could not be satisfied with these philosophical refinements, and protested against them. The argument which I am about to quote was offered first on what seems to me a very remarkable occasion. Dionysius of Alexandria is a man whom we know mainly by some extracts from his writings preserved by Eusebius; and there is none of the early Fathers who impresses me more favourably as a man of earnest piety, good sense, moderation, and Christian charity. On the occasion to which I refer he worked what I account one of the greatest and most authentic miracles of ecclesiastical history. His diocese being much troubled with disputes on the

---

the so-called Alogi than what he learned from Hippolytus. There are two discrepancies between his account and that of Philaster. Epiphanius speaks of these heretics as ascribing both Gospel and Apocalypse to Cerinthus; but we may take this as an ordinary instance of his carelessness in using his authorities, for there is no doubt that Philaster is right in naming only the Apocalypse as so ascribed. The other difference relates to the name Alogi, for which name Epiphanius, as I have said, takes credit as his own invention. Early writers on heresy had taken the opportunity of stigmatizing opponents by enumerating as heretics, in addition to the well-known *sects* of heretics, Valentinians, Marcionites, &c., the holders of various opinions from which they dissented. Thus Philaster has in his list of heretics those who denied all the 150 Psalms to have been written by David (*Haer.* 130); those who denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*Haer.* 89); those who asserted the plurality of worlds (*Haer.* 115); those who held the age of the world to be uncertain (*Haer.* 112), &c. &c. But there are no anonymous heretics in Epiphanius. Where he finds in his authorities those who held this or that erroneous opinion described as heretics, he must invent a name for them—a habit which gives the modern reader the impression that the Alogi, for example, were a set of people combined into a sect, for which idea there is no foundation. Thus when we trace back Epiphanius to his authorities, we find that his reason for asserting the existence of a sect of Alogi was that Hippolytus had enumerated among heretics 'those who reject the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John.' If we inquire whom Hippolytus had in view, we can answer confidently, his antagonist Caius.

Millennarian controversy, he assembled those whom perhaps another bishop would have denounced as heretics; and he held a three days' public discussion with them: the result being what I have never heard of as the result of any other public discussion—that he talked his opponents round, and brought all to complete agreement with himself (*H. E.* vii. 24). I am, however, less surprised at this result from the specimen which Eusebius gives us of the manner in which Dionysius dealt with the authority of the leading Millennarian of his district, Nepos, who was then not long dead, and whose name had at that time the authority which that of Keble has now, the favour in which his sacred poetry was held gaining favour for a certain school of theological opinions. Nothing can be more conciliatory than the graceful way in which Dionysius speaks of Nepos and of the services which he had rendered the Church; in particular by his composition of hymns, for which Dionysius expresses a high value, though he claims the liberty which he is sure Nepos himself, if living, would have allowed him, of testing his opinions by Scripture. The most formidable difficulty

---

If we ask had he anyone else in view, we must say that we have no evidence.

But did Caius reject the Gospel? This is asserted by no other writer, and in the Syriac fragments Caius is refuted out of the Gospel, as if it were an authority which he recognized. It is no doubt possible that Caius, in his opposition to the Montanists, may have spoken disparagingly of the Gospel, on which they founded their hopes of the teaching of the Paraclete; but it is also possible that Hippolytus, being convinced of the common authorship of Gospel and Apocalypse, thought himself entitled to use the controversial advantage of bracketing the opponents of one with the opponents of the other. Irenæus informs us of the existence of heretics who rejected St. John's Gospel, though his language is too vague to let us know to what school they belonged.

I consider that the work of Hippolytus, of which Epiphanius made use, must have said very little about the opponents of the Gospel. Where Epiphanius deals with the opponents of the Apocalypse, the objections and replies have every mark of antiquity, and were no doubt derived from Hippolytus. But the section on the Gospel is distinctly Epiphanius's own. He cites authors later than Hippolytus: Ephraem (c. 22); Porphyry (c. 8). The system of chronology is not that of Hippolytus, nor does he agree with Hippolytus as to the duration of our Lord's ministry on earth. The whole section gives me the impression that Epiphanius, being obliged by his title to answer objections to the Gospel, and finding none specified in his authorities, was reduced to manufacture objections, as well as answers, by his own ingenuity.

Dionysius has to encounter in dealing with the Millennarians is the Apocalypse, and this he meets by a theory of his own. The criticism of Dionysius, and his denial that the John of the Apocalypse was the Apostle John, rests, you will observe, on no external evidence, and is opposed to the uniform tradition of the Church up to that time. Dionysius begins, as I have already told you, by speaking of the objections which some of his predecessors had raised against the authority of the book. 'But, for my part,' he proceeds, 'I do not venture to reject the book, since many of the brethren hold it in esteem; but I take it to be above my understanding to comprehend it, and I conceive the interpretation of each several part to be hidden and marvellous. For, though I do not understand, yet I surmise that some deeper meaning underlies the words. These things I do not measure and judge by my own reasoning; but, giving the chief place to faith, I am of opinion that they are too high for me to comprehend. I believe also the author's name to be John, for he himself says so, but I cannot easily grant him to be the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, whose is the Gospel that is inscribed "according to John," and the Catholic Epistle, for I infer from the tone (ἦθος) of each, and the character of the language, and from what is called the διεξαγωγή of the book [general method], that he is not the same person.' The arguments which Dionysius then proceeds to urge are, first, that the Evangelist mentions his name neither in the Gospel nor in the First Epistle, and in the other two Epistles only calls himself the Elder, while the author of the Apocalypse calls himself John three times in the first chapter and once in the last: but never calls himself the disciple whom Jesus loved, or the brother of James, or the man who had seen and heard the Lord. It is to be supposed that there were many of the name of John, as, for example, we read of John Mark in the Acts. Many who admired John, no doubt, gave the name to their children for the love they bore him, just as many of the faithful now call their children by the names of Peter and Paul. 'And it is said that there are two tombs at Ephesus, each bearing the name of John's tomb.' He next argues that there is great similarity of style between the Gospel and Epistle, and a number of

expressions common to both, such as life, light, the avoiding of darkness, with the commandment of love one towards another, &c., none of which are to be found in the Revelation, which has not a syllable in common with the other two: that Paul in his Epistles mentions having been favoured with revelations, and that there is no corresponding mention in the Epistle of St. John. Lastly, he presses the argument from the difference of style: 'The Gospel and Epistle,' he says, 'are written not only without offending against the Greek language, but even most eloquently in point of expression, reasoning, and literary construction, far from containing any barbarous word, or solecism, or vulgarism. For the Apostle, it seems, possessed either word, even as God gave him both —the word of knowledge and the word of language; but as for this writer, that he saw a revelation and received knowledge and prophecy, I will not gainsay; yet I perceive his dialect and tongue to be not accurately Greek, nay, that he uses barbarous idioms, and in some cases even solecisms, instances whereof it needs not that I should now detail; for neither have I mentioned them in ridicule—let no one suppose it—but only as criticizing the dissimilarity of the books' (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25).

This passage contains all the arguments used by modern writers against the common authorship of Gospel and Apocalypse, except one which I have already answered, namely, that the Apocalypse is the work of a Judaizing Christian, the Gospel that of one of ultra-Pauline liberality. I have shown that in this respect the Apocalypse is completely Pauline (see p. 30).

I do not think it necessary to spend much time on the first argument of Dionysius, viz. that founded on the fact that the author of the Apocalypse has given his name, both in the first and third person, while both Gospel and Epistle are anonymous. In such a matter it is very possible that the same man might act differently on different occasions, even though we could assign no reason for his change of conduct. But in this case a sufficient reason can be given. In the Old Testament the rule is that the historical books (with the exception, indeed, of the Book of Nehemiah) are all anonymous; but

every prophetical book, without any exception, gives the name of the prophet to whom the vision or prophecy was communicated. The whole Book of the Revelation is framed on the model of the Old Testament prophecies, so that it is a matter of course that it should begin by naming the seer whose visions are recorded, while it would be quite natural that a historical book by the same author should be anonymous.* Nor can more stress be laid on the remark that John does not in the Apocalypse call himself an Apostle, or the disciple whom Jesus loved. The simplicity of the language 'I John,' without further description of the writer, is, when well considered, rather a proof of Apostolic authority. A writer personating the Apostle would have taken care to make the Apostleship unmistakeably plain to the reader: and another John writing with an honest purpose would have distinguished himself plainly from John the Apostle. But this author betrays no desire to make himself prominent; and the idea of any other person being mistaken for him does not seem to have crossed his mind.

Very much more consideration is due to the argument which Dionysius founded on the difference of language between the Revelation and the other Johannine books. Thus, he says, we do not find in the Revelation the Johannine words, *ζωή*, *φῶς*, *ἀλήθεια*, *χάρις*, *κρίσις*, &c. It must be owned that, whereas the likeness between the language of the Gospel and of the First Epistle is such that even a careless reader can hardly fail to notice it, there are several of the words frequently occurring in the other Johannine books which are either rare in the Apocalypse or absent from it. But then it must be remembered how completely different the subjects treated of in the Apocalypse are from those which are dealt with in the other books. It is not wonderful that a writer should use different words when he wants to express an entirely new circle of ideas. On the other hand, when we look beyond the superficial aspects of the books, and carefully examine their language, we arrive at a result quite

* The transition from the third to the first person 'his servant John' (i. 1), 'I John' (i. 9, xxi. 2, xxii. 2), is exactly parallel to the usage of Isaiah (i. 1, ii. 1, vi. 1, &c.), and of Daniel (i. 6, vii. 1, 2, 15, &c.).

different from that obtained by Dionysius. There is found to be so much affinity both of thought and diction between the various books which have been ascribed to John, that we can feel confident that all must have proceeded, if not from the same author, from the same school.

I proceed to lay before you some of the proofs that, if we adopt the now pretty generally accepted opinion that John the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse, we shall find ourselves bound to hold that the Gospel was written either by the Apostle himself, or by a disciple of his who had not only thoroughly adopted his master's doctrine, but even much of his language. I have spoken already of the identity of the Christology of the Apocalypse with that of the Gospel, the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence being taught as distinctly in the former (*e.g.* iii. 14) as in the latter. I have shown (p. 31) that the Book of the Revelation refuses to own the unbelieving Jews as true Jews. This, also, is in complete harmony with John viii. 39, which refuses to recognize as children of Abraham those who did not the works of Abraham. Let me now direct your attention to the title given to our Lord in the Apocalypse (xix. 13), the 'Word of God,' which at once connects that book with the Gospel and the Epistle. The Logos doctrine of the Gospel has been considered as a mark of late authorship, or at least as indicating an author more subject to Alexandrian influences than the historical John is likely to have been. On that subject I have spoken already (p. 73). But now we find that in the Apocalypse, which is admitted by Renan and by a host of Rationalist writers to be the work of John, and to which they assign an earlier date than orthodox critics had claimed for any of the Johannine books, this very title 'Logos' is given to the Saviour. All objection, therefore, against the likelihood of the Apostle having used this title at once disappears. A second title repeatedly given to our Lord in the Book of the Revelation is the Lamb. Nowhere else in Scripture is it used thus as a title of the Saviour, except in the first chapter of the Gospel—'Behold the Lamb of God.' It is scarcely necessary for me to call your attention to the sacrificial import of this title. The two books elsewhere (John xi. 51, 52; Rev. v. 9) un-

equivocally express the same doctrine, which can be stated in words which I am persuaded John had read: 'Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot' (1 Pet. i. 18, 19).* It is plain what dignity must have been ascribed to the person of Him to whose death such far-reaching efficacy is attributed.

We have in the beginning of the Revelation (i. 7): 'Every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him.' Now the piercing of our Lord is only recorded by St. John; and in this passage the prophet Zechariah is quoted in a form differing from the Septuagint, but agreeing with the Gospel. We have repeatedly the phrase 'he that overcometh,' which is of frequent occurrence in all the Johannine books: Rev. ii. 7, 11, iii. 5, xii. 11, xxi. 7; John xvi. 33; 1 John ii. 13, iv. 4, v. 4. The remarkable word ἀληθινός occurs nine times in the Gospel, four times in the Epistle, ten times in the Revelation, and only five times in all the rest of the New Testament. Similar evidence may be drawn from the prevalence of the words μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία in all the Johannine books. In the Revelation (ii. 17) Jesus promises believers 'the hidden manna;' in the Gospel (referring also to the manna) 'the true bread from heaven' (John vi. 32). In the Gospel (vii. 37) Jesus cries, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink;' in the Apocalypse (xxii. 17), 'Let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.'† The abiding of God with man is in both books pre-

* This is one of several coincidences between Peter's Epistle and the Johannine books: 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9, Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. v. 13, Rev. xiv. 8, xvii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, Rev. i. 1, iii. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23, 1 John iii. 9, John i. 13, iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 22, 1 John iii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 2, John x. 11, xxi. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 18, 1 John iii. 7; 1 Pet. i. 10, John xii. 41; 1 Pet. v. 13, 2 John 1. These coincidences seem to me more than accidental. When I come to treat of Peter's Epistle I will give my reasons for preferring the explanation that John had read that Epistle to the supposition that the Epistle is post-Johannine.

† Other coincidences are: σκηνοῦν, John i. 14, Rev. vii. 15, xii. 12, xiii. 6, xxi. 3; 'Lord, thou knowest,' Rev. vii. 14, John xxi. 15–17: ἔχειν μέρος (= to partake), John xiii. 8, Rev. xx. 6; σφάττειν, 1 John iii. 12, Rev. v. 6, 9, 12, vi. 4, 9, xiii. 3, 8, xviii. 24; ὕψις, John vii. 24, xi. 44,

sented as the issue of Christ's work (John xiv. 23; Rev. iii. 20, xxi. 3).

I have produced instances enough to establish decisively that there is the closest possible affinity between the Revelation and the other Johannine books. The only question on which there is room for controversy is whether that affinity is such as by itself to be a sufficient proof of identity of authorship. In deciding on this question attention ought of course to be paid to the differences that have been pointed out. For example, our Lord's title is the 'Word of God' in the Revelation; simply the 'Word' in the Gospel. Christ is the Lamb in both books; but in the Gospel ὁ ἀμνός, in the Revelation τὸ ἀρνίον; but the latter form may have been preferred in order to give more point to the opposition which in the latter book constantly prevails between τὸ ἀρνίον and τὸ θηρίον. In the Gospel there is a manifest reason why the Baptist, pointing to Jesus, should use the masculine, not the neuter. So, again, we have in the Revelation 'he that overcometh,' absolutely; but in the preceding books with an object: 'he that overcometh the world,' &c. There are likewise peculiarities of the Gospel which are absent from the Apocalypse, such as the use of ἵνα with the subjunctive instead of the ordinary construction with the infinitive, and fondness for οὖν as a connecting-link in a narrative. It would be important to discuss these differences if I were contending that it is possible by internal evidence alone to decide between the hypothesis that the author of the Gospel was the same as the author of the Revelation, and the hypothesis that the one was a disciple and imitator of the other. But the question with which we

---

Rev. i. 16; τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, Rev. iii. 8, 10, xxii. 7, 9, John viii. 51–55, xiv. 23, 24, xv. 20, xvii. 6, 1 John ii. 5; ἑβραϊστί twice in the Revelation, five times in the Gospel. None of these expressions are found in the New Testament, except in the Johannine books. Christ is compared to a bridegroom, John iii. 29, Rev. xix. 7, xxi. 2, xxii. 17. Other examples will be found in Davidson, whose candour here and elsewhere in fairly presenting the evidence on both sides is worthy of all praise. Notwithstanding the perversity of some of his decisions, and, what is more irritating, the oracular tone of infallibility with which he enunciates his private opinions as if they were ascertained facts, Davidson has done great service to English students by collecting a mass of information which they will not easily find elsewhere.

are actually concerned is different: it is whether we are bound to reject the very strong external evidence for identity of authorship, on the ground that internal evidence demonstrates that both works could not have had the same author. I have shown that no such result can be obtained under the present head of argument, the resemblances between the books being far more striking than the differences. I suppose there are no two works of the same author between which *some* points of difference might not be found by a minute critic, especially if the works were written at some distance of time from each other. No two books can be more alike than the First and Second Epistles of St. John; eight of the thirteen verses of which the latter consists are to be found in the former, either in sense or expression. Yet Davidson is careful to show that a minute critic would be at no loss for proofs of diversity of authorship. The one has εἴ τις, the other ἐάν τις; the one ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, the other ἐληλυθότα ἐν σαρκί, and so on. Some years ago Dr. Stanley Leathes* applied to our English poets the methods of minute criticism that have been freely used on our sacred books. He found that of about 450 words in Milton's *L'Allegro*, over 300 are not to be found in the longer poem *Il Penseroso*, and over 300 do not occur in the still longer poem *Lycidas*. So likewise, of about 590 words in Tennyson's *Lotos-eaters*, there are 360 which are not found in the longer poem *Œnone*.

I pass to the last and strongest of the arguments of Dionysius: that drawn from the solecisms of style. The Gospel and First Epistle are written in what, if not classical Greek, is smooth, unexceptionable, and free from barbarisms and solecisms in grammar. The Greek of the Revelation is startling from the first: John to the seven Churches of Asia, grace to you and peace ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, to him that loved us τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λούσαντι ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν. Instances of false apposition such as occur in this example present themselves several times where a noun in a dependent case has a

* *Boyle Lectures*, 1868, p. 283.

nominative in apposition with it.* It is not worth while to discuss other deviations from Greek usage, several that have been noticed not being peculiar to the Apocalypse.

Some well-meaning critics have set themselves to extenuate these irregularities, and they have at least succeeded in showing that some considerable deductions ought fairly to be made from the list. They have produced from classical writers examples of anacoluthon, of false apposition, of construction *ad sensum;* and it is urged with reason that we are not to expect in the abrupt utterances of a 'rapt seer, borne from vision to vision,' a regard for strict grammatical regularity, which is frequently neglected in calmer compositions.

At the revival of learning, many excellent men were shocked at the assertion of scholars, that barbarisms and solecisms were to be found in New Testament Greek; and those who were called 'Purists' endeavoured to clear the sacred writers from what they regarded as a dishonouring aspersion. They ought to have reflected that it would be just as reasonable to maintain that the sacred writers ought to have been empowered to write in English, as in any kind of Greek save that which was spoken at the time and in the place in which they lived. It is difficult for us now to imagine how anyone could have persuaded himself to think that a miracle must needs have been wrought to enable the sacred writers to use a language not their own, thus obliterating the evidence which the character of the style bears to the time and circumstances under which the books were written.

In the case of the Apocalypse, the character of the language corresponds very well with what might be expected from the author to whom it is ascribed. It gives us no reason to disbelieve that this author had a sufficiency of Greek for colloquial purposes. His anacolutha do not prove him to be ignorant of the ordinary rules of Greek construction. The very rules which he breaks in one place he observes in others. The use of such a phrase as *ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν* could not possibly be the result of ignorance that *ἀπό* governs the genitive case. One

* Thus: *τῆς καινῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα* (iii. 12), *ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς* (xiv. 12), *τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος* (xx. 2).

who could make such a mistake through ignorance would be incapable of writing the rest of the book. This example is rather to be paralleled by 'I AM hath sent me,' in the authorized version of Ex. iii. 14. This very text seems to have suggested the ὁ ὤν of St. John, while ὁ ἦν is a bold attempt to supply the want of a past participle of the substantive verb. As for ὁ ἐρχόμενος, there may possibly be a reference to our Lord's second coming, but it is also quite possible that the form ἐσόμενος, which only occurs once *N. T.*, was not familiar to the writer. As there may be a great difference between the copiousness of the vocabulary possessed by two persons who speak the same language (the stock of words that suffices to express the ideas of the rustic being wholly inadequate for the necessities of the literary man), so there may be equal difference in respect of the variety of grammatical forms habitually employed. In particular there is sure to be such a difference between the language of the native and that of the foreigner. One who learns a language late in life finds it hard to obtain a mastery of any complicated system of inflexions; and this, no doubt, is why we find that in the modern languages of Europe which are derived from the Latin the varieties of case endings have been in great measure obliterated. We can thus understand how it is that John, accustomed to Aramaic which has no case endings, though not ignorant of the use of the oblique cases, is glad to slide back into the use of the nominative. Then, again, of the forms known to grammarians several are but rarely needed for practical use; and with want of practice the power of correct use is apt to be lost. When I was young, members of the Society of Friends affected the use of the second person singular, but its use elsewhere had become so obsolete that they were unable to employ it grammatically. 'Thee' became a nominative case, and was made to agree with a verb in the third person.* A foreigner who has learned to manipulate correctly the grammatical forms which are of

* Tennyson also has been lately accused of bad grammar in his use of the second person singular by employing 'wert' in the indicative mood instead of 'wast.' In this matter, however, he is kept in countenance by several preceding poets.

frequent occurrence will be apt to find them insufficient for his needs when he proceeds to literary composition. John, for example, might be in the constant habit of employing the participle present, and yet not be equally familiar with the use of participles future. The Apocalypse, then, is exactly what might have been written by one whose native language was Aramaic, who was able to use Greek for the ordinary purposes of life, but who found a strain put on his knowledge of the language when he desired to make a literary use of it.

But how is it then that the Greek of the Gospel should be so much better, if both books were written by the same author? I am not sure that the Greek of the Gospel does display so very much wider a knowledge of grammatical forms. A grammarian does not find so much at which to take exception; but this may be because less has been attempted. It is much easier to turn into another language such sentences as 'In the beginning was the Word,' &c., than such a phrase as 'which is, and which was, and which is to come.' It is on account of this more restricted range of grammatical forms that the Gospel of St. John has been so often used as the first book of a beginner learning a foreign language.*

But without extenuating too much the superiority of the Greek of the Gospel over that of the Revelation, two explanations of that difference can be given. The opinion of critics, orthodox as well as sceptical, now tends to reverse the doctrine of older writers which made the Apocalypse much the later book of the two, and to give it, on the contrary, ten, perhaps twenty, years of greater antiquity than the Gospel. Admit that St. John was no longer young when he came to Ephesus, and therefore that no very radical change in his language was to be expected; still, living in a Greek city, and with crowds of Greek disciples about him to whom he would daily have to expound his doctrines in their own

* Canon Westcott says in his *Introduction* (p. l), which I had not read when I wrote the above: 'To speak of St. John's Gospel as "written in very pure Greek" is altogether misleading. It is free from solecisms, because it avoids all idiomatic expressions.' And he goes on to remark that there is at most one instance of the use of the *oratio obliqua*.

language, he could not fail to acquire greater facility in its use, and a power of expressing his ideas such as he had not possessed when he had merely used the language for ordinary colloquial purposes. There would have been fair ground for suspicion, if there had been no superiority over the Greek of the Apocalypse, in a book written after a score of years, during which the author was speaking little or no Aramaic, and must have been habitually speaking Greek.

The second consideration is that of possible assistance. I have known two letters sent to the Continent bearing the same signature written in the same foreign language, but possibly differing from each other in grammatical accuracy as much as the Gospel and Apocalypse; and the explanation was not that the writer was different, but only that, in the one case, not in the other, he had taken the precaution before sending his composition to get it looked over by a better linguist than himself. St. Paul, we know, habitually used the services of an amanuensis; so also may St. John; and for all we know the disciple may have been a better Greek scholar than his master. If a solecism were dictated to him he might silently correct it (as we find that in the later MSS. scribes have corrected several in the Apocalypse), or he might at least call his master's attention to it. The linguistic differences, therefore, between the Apocalypse and the Gospel could all be accounted for by the supposition that John wrote the former book with his own hand, and in the latter employed the services of an amanuensis. In short, when we compare the books in an English translation, we find the marks of common authorship predominate: it is when we look at them in the Greek that we are struck by a difference. May not the explanation be, that the Apostle thought in Aramaic, and that his thoughts were rendered into Greek by different hands?

Such explanations being available, the differences of language that have been pointed out come very far short of demonstrating diversity of authorship. The conclusion, then, to which I consider we are led by a comparative study of the books is, that the Apocalypse and the other Johannine books clearly belong to the same school: the first is as closely re-

lated to the rest as the Epistle to the Hebrews is to St. Paul's Epistles. If we regard the evidence from language solely, I do not think we are in a position either to affirm or deny that the same man wrote all the books. There are resemblances between them such as to make it very credible that it was so; but at the same time there are differences which indicate that the Revelation must at least have been written at a different time or under different circumstances from the others. Some other topics of internal evidence will afterwards come under consideration.

XIV.

Part III.

THE DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

It will be convenient if before proceeding further I state in more detail the modern theory as to the date of the Book of the Revelation. I have already said that modern critics, who agree with Dionysius in assigning the Gospel and Apocalypse to different authors, differ from him by claiming Apostolic authority for the latter, not the former. And in this case we have the singular instance of sceptical critics assigning to a New Testament book an earlier date than the orthodox had claimed for it. The latter, following Irenæus, had assigned the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian, and had regarded it as the last work of the Apostle John, written in extreme old age. Modern critics, on the other hand, are willing to grant the book a quarter of a century of greater antiquity. From the verse xvii. 10, 'There are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come,' they infer that the book was written after the death of five Roman emperors, and during the reign of the sixth. There is a difference in the way of counting Roman emperors, which, however, is made not to affect the result. If we begin the reckoning with Augustus, Nero is the fifth, shortly after whose death the book is supposed to be written. In fact this

fixes the date within very narrow limits, for the reign of Galba only lasted from May 68 to January 69. The more usual computation made Julius the first of Roman emperors,* and this is adopted by Renan ; but the date which he assigns the book is the same; for his theory is, that though Nero was really dead at the time, he was supposed by the author of the book to be still living, so that the five kings then dead were Nero's five predecessors.

The disappearance of Nero was so sudden, and his death witnessed by so few persons, that vague rumours got abroad, especially in Asia and Achaia, that he was not really dead. Tacitus tells us (*Hist.* ii. 8, 9) that an impostor speedily took advantage of this state of feeling. He is said to have been of servile origin, was like Nero in personal appearance, and had the same musical skill. Giving himself out to be the emperor, he got some followers about him, and established himself in a little local sovereignty, the centre of his power being Cythnos (one of the Cyclades not far from Patmos), to which island he had been driven by tempests when crossing the sea. But his power was of short duration; for he was slain early in the reign of Otho, and his body was sent round to different cities, in order completely to dispel the delusion which he had excited. Some twenty years later, however, there was again talk of a false Nero, the pretender this time having presented himself in Parthia, where he obtained credence, protection, and support (Suet., *Nero*, 57). The belief that the matricide Nero had fled beyond the Euphrates is expressed in the Sibylline books, iv. 119, 137, and accordingly the book containing the verses referred to is judged to be a Jewish composition of the date 80 or 90. Now the Apocalyptist is regarded by Renan and the other interpreters of the same school as having shared this belief about Nero. This is what is supposed to be implied in the verses xiii. 3, 12, 14: 'I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed;' and again, xvii. 11: 'The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition,' which is interpreted to mean

* See the authorities quoted by Renan, *L'Antechrist*, p. 407.

that Nero, one of the seven emperors, was to return and rule for a time as the eighth. The mention of the kings of the East, xvi. 12, is interpreted as containing a reference to the Parthians, by whose aid Nero was to be restored.*

This is the theory which is elaborated in Renan's fourth volume (*L'Antechrist*). It was at once accepted by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (Oct., 1874), whom I imagined at the time (I do not know whether or not correctly) to be Dean Stanley; and more recently by Archdeacon Farrar (*Expositor*, 1881). Renan's view, and it is that most popular among Rationalist critics, is that this work was written by the Apostle John at Ephesus in that crisis which agitated every Jewish mind, the great Jewish war with the Romans, in the end of the year 68 or beginning of 69, a couple of years before the destruction of Jerusalem. What the seer is supposed to anticipate and to predict in the beginning of the eleventh chapter is that the siege would to a certain extent be successful, and the city be trodden under foot of the Gentiles for three years and a-half; but that the Temple should not be taken, for that our Lord's second coming should rescue the Jews and be accompanied by the destruction of Rome.

The 'beast' of the Revelation is said to be Nero, and Renan has revelled in the accumulation of a multitude of offensive details, which have been faithfully transcribed by his English followers, with the view of showing how applicable the title of wild beast was to that monster. But, in my opinion, no one who compares the Book of Daniel with the Apocalypse will require any ingenious explanation of the use of the imagery of beasts in the latter book beyond the fact that it occurs in the former. It is supposed, however, that all doubt has been now removed through the discovery in quite recent times of

* I note here that it is an attempt to combine inconsistent hypotheses when quotations are accumulated which speak of the belief that Nero had fled to Parthia, and when this belief is ascribed to the Apocalyptist. For we only hear of Parthia in connexion with Nero full twenty years after that emperor's death; and naturally it would not be until after all trace of him had disappeared from the West that the imagination would spring up that he was hiding in the distant East. If, as Renan would have it, John wrote in the reign of Galba, and believed the impostor of Cythnos to be the veritable Nero redivivus, he could not also believe Nero to be then lurking in Parthia. On this subject may be consulted Arnold, *Die Neronische Christenverfolgung*, sect. viii.

the true explanation of the mysterious number 666.* This is said to be Nero Cæsar written in Hebrew letters נרון קסר.† And what is supposed to demonstrate the correctness of this solution is, that it accounts equally for the numbers 666 and 616, both of which were early found in MSS. of the Apocalypse (see p. 224). For the difference is explained as arising from a difference in the way of spelling Νέρων with or without the final letter, the numerical value of which in Hebrew is 50.

Who the false prophet was, who is described (xiii. 11, xix. 20) as working miracles and compelling men to worship the beast and receive his mark, these interpreters are less agreed. One (Volkmar) gravely maintains that the person intended is St. Paul, who by instructing Christians (in Rom. xiii.) to submit to the higher powers had made himself the prophet of Nero. Another suggests that it might be the historian Josephus. A third contends for Simon Magus. Archdeacon Farrar upholds the claims of the emperor Vespasian. But these modern expositors of the Apocalypse all agree in putting forward an interpretation from which it results that the book is in every sense of the word a false prophecy—a prediction falsified by the event. It foretold that Nero was to recover his power, but in point of fact he was then dead; it foretold (and apparently in ignorance of the prophecy which Matthew has put into the mouth of our Lord) that the temple should not be taken; but actually not one stone of it was left upon another; and, finally, it foretold that the provinces should cast off the Roman domination and destroy the imperial city; for this is the interpretation given to chap. xvii. 6, 17—the ten horns, into whose heart God had put it for a time to give their kingdom to the beast, shall now hate the whore, make her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. But, in point of fact, the wars that followed the death of Nero had no such result. On the contrary, under the Flavian emperors, the dominion of Rome was more firmly established than ever.

* There are rival claimants for the honour of this discovery—Fritzsche, Benary, Reuss, and Hitzig. See Farrar, *Expositor*, p. 347.

† Thus: נ = 50, ר = 200, ו = 6, נ = 50, ק = 100, ס = 60, ר = 200; total = 666.

I confess that I am under a certain disadvantage in criticizing any theory which professes to give the true interpretation of the Apocalypse, for I have to own myself unable to give any better solution of my own, feeling like one of Cicero's disputants, 'facilius me, talibus de rebus, quid non sentirem, quam quid sentirem, posse dicere.' However, I am bound to state the difficulties which prevent me from accepting the theory, now becoming fashionable, as furnishing the true solution.

And it seems almost enough to appeal to the estimation in which the Apocalypse has been held from the first. Is it a credible hypothesis that any man ever gained for himself permanent reputation as an inspired prophet by making a prediction which was falsified within a year of the time when it was delivered? According to this theory, St. John does not, like some pretenders to the gift of prophecy, make himself pretty safe by postponing to some tolerably distant future the date when his prophecy is to come to pass. He undertakes boldly to foretell the event of the great military operation of his time. For a parallel case we should imagine Victor Hugo, or some other French prophet, in Christmas, 1870, issuing a prediction that Paris should to a certain extent be taken, and a third part of the city burnt, but that the Germans should not get the mastery over the whole; for that there would be an uprising of the other German nations against the Prussians, ending with the total destruction of the city of Berlin, to the great joy of Europe. We can imagine some one mad enough to make such a prophecy as this; but if so, can we imagine that a prediction so wild and so unfortunate should make the reputation of the prophet, and that the book which contained it should live for generations as an inspired document? In the case of the Apocalypse, as we are asked to understand it, the seer could hardly have had time to publish his predictions before he must have himself wished to recall or suppress them, their failure was so rapid. Possibly within a month after they were made the pretended Nero was killed and his imposture exposed. Then came a rapid succession of emperors, proving that it was a mistake to limit their number to seven, and, not long after, the destruction of Jerusalem, from which the Temple did not escape.

According to this theory, too, we must suppose that the intention of the Apocalypse was understood at the time it was published. For otherwise what object could there be in the work? It was intended, we are told, to inspire in Christians certain hopes and expectations; and in order to have this effect, its general purpose, at least, must have been made plain. And yet the knowledge of the writer's meaning completely perished. Irenæus, separated from the book by only one generation, and professing to be able to report the tradition concerning the number of the beast handed down by men who had seen John face to face, is utterly ignorant of its purport. The solution of Nero for 666 is quite unknown to him, and he is so far from connecting the book with the times of Nero as to refer the work to the reign of Domitian.* He has not the least suspicion that recourse is to be had to the Hebrew alphabet, but treats it as a self-evident principle that Greek numerals are to be employed.†

* On this subject Davidson says (*Introduction*, i 276), 'Irenæus calls the emperor Domitian; Epiphanius calls him Claudius; the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, Nero, with which Theophylact agrees.' Davidson omitted to caution his readers that all these authorities are not of equal value, but I find it not superfluous to add this warning. The student cannot too early learn to disregard writers cited as authorities, if they have no real knowledge of the matters in respect of which their testimony is appealed to. In the present case, Irenæus deserves to be listened to, for he claims, as I have said, to be able to report the testimony of those who had seen John face to face. We may have good reasons for rejecting his statement, but among good reasons cannot be reckoned the opposing testimony of writers whose authority in opposition to his is absolutely insignificant. Concerning Epiphanius I have spoken, p. 168. He probably got the Claudian date, which is certainly wrong, from the Apocryphal acts of Leucius, which will be described in a later lecture. The Syriac version referred to is certainly not earlier than the sixth century, and there is no evidence to show that the superscription which mentions Nero is as old as the version. Of Theophylact, it is enough to say that he lived at the end of the eleventh century.

† τοῦ λόγου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ὁ ἀριθμὸς τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ψῆφον διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων [ἐμφαίνεται, Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8] sexcentos habebit et sexaginta et sex (Lat. trans., Iren. v. 30). I suspect that Eusebius, in abridging his extract, has slightly distorted the meaning. He makes Irenæus say that reason teaches that the calculation must be made by Greek letters, which seems a bold assertion. But I take it that what Irenæus looks on as established by the arguments he has used is, that the numerical value of the Greek letters in the name of the beast must make, not 616, but six hundreds, six tens, six units. But either way he takes for granted, without doubt, that the calculation must be made by Greek numerals.

The argument just used, that permanent reputation could not have been gained by a prophecy which signally failed, may seem to lose its force if it be true (as the Edinburgh Reviewer contends) that St. John's prophecy, as he understands it, did not fail. 'It is perfectly certain,' he writes, 'that Nero did not in fact return; that the Roman Empire did not in fact break up till more than three centuries later; that not a part but the whole of Jerusalem and of the Jewish Temple was destroyed; that the Second Advent of our Lord to judgment did not soon, nay, has not yet occurred. But in spite of all this, we venture to say that the Apocalypse of St. John, that Hebrew prophecy, on the whole, has nevertheless not failed; that, properly understood, its forecasts have been, for every rational and religious purpose, successful.' And he goes on to explain that it is religious confidence in God which is the essential teaching of all the Hebrew books; that in the Bible 'all ethical speculation is reduced to its ultimate and most practical terminology in the word "faith." In details we are very likely to be entirely mistaken, but they who have believed will find at last that they were not deceived, that Christ, not Antichrist, rules the universe, that God and not the devil is supreme, and must in the end be triumphant.' Mere soothsaying, we are told, was never in any marked degree the intention of prophecy at all. But when 'Apocalypse,' which may be called the decay, the senility of prophecy, began to busy itself with mere world-empires and with the political succession of events, it cannot be a matter of surprise if its predictions went astray. But though a succession of Apocalyptic efforts to sketch out the future triumph of 'God's kingdom' over the world-empires signally failed in time, in place, in circumstance, it more signally came true in the barbarian overthrow of the Roman Empire, and the establishment of modern Christendom.

Substantially the same view is taken by Archdeacon Farrar. He censures Luther's remark that 'for many reasons he regarded the book as neither Apostolic nor prophetic.' The Archdeacon holds it to be both, and considers that Luther's unwarrantable judgment proceeded from a deficient acquaintance with the necessary characteristics of the Apocalyptic

style. The Apocalyptic method differed from the prophetic, and appears to stand upon a lower level of predictive insight. But the prophecies of this book have 'springing and germinant developments.' Nero did not, as was popularly supposed, take refuge among the Parthians, and was not restored by their means; but the prophecy has received an adequate fulfilment in the appearance of successive Antichrists with Neronian characteristics, Domitian, Decius, Diocletian, and many a subsequent persecutor of the saints of God.

It is not the business of this course of lectures to discuss the proper method of interpreting prophecy; for the purposes of my argument it is enough to know what was the method of interpretation which prevailed at the time the Apocalypse was published. Now I feel myself safe in saying that the view is quite modern which regards prophecy as a kind of sacred song of which the melody only need be attended to, the words to which the air is set being quite unimportant. The ideas of the Jewish mind had been formed by the Mosaic direction (Deut. xviii. 22): 'When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously.' Even if this rule had not the sanction of Revelation, it expresses the view of the matter which uninstructed people are apt to take. It may be true that 'mere soothsaying is not the intention of prophecy;' but still they will think that if what the prophet says is not sooth he is no real prophet. And it is difficult to put them off with evasions. A fortune-teller accused of obtaining money on false pretences would plead in vain that though the actual good things she had promised were not fulfilled, her customers would find her predictions true, in the sense that if they had faith and patience something good would somehow, at some time or other, turn up. I remember what success Dr. Cumming had as an interpreter of Apocalyptic prophecy; how eagerly new books of his were welcomed, and by what thousands they were sold. But he did what St. John is said to have done, namely, venture on predictions, the truth of which the next following three or four years would test. Dr. Cumming was surely entitled to all the allowances for

want of accuracy in his forecasts that can be demanded for the author on whom he commented; yet, when the things which he foretold did not come to pass, his credit fell and his books disappeared. And I see no reason to think that Christians in the first century were more indulgent critics of Apocalyptic predictions. And so I still feel that the success obtained by the Book of the Revelation of St. John throws a great difficulty in the way of our receiving the modern explanation of its design. If the book, considered as a prophecy, failed as completely as Dr. Cumming's, why did it not fall into the same oblivion as Dr. Cumming's books?

When I lay down one of those modern essays which claim to give a key to the meaning of the book, on the ground of a plausible explanation of three or four selected texts, and then take up the book itself, I find such a want of correspondence that I can only compare the case to a claim to have solved a double acrostic, advanced on the score of a fair guess at two or three of the 'lights,' without any attempt being made to elucidate the rest. If the book was intended to assure the minds of Christians by informing them of the result of the siege of Jerusalem, or of the political movements of their own time, that idea is strangely cast into the background. It is only the opening chapters which appear to speak of then present events, and these are occupied not with temporal matters in Judea, but with the spiritual condition of the Churches of Asia Minor. The theme of the whole book is our Lord's second coming; it is only by laborious search that a verse here and there can be found, of which a political explanation can be offered. In order to accept the most successful of the explanations, a good deal of charitable allowance for vagueness must be made. If we are to confine interpreters to the date they themselves fix, the reign of Galba (and a later date involves the abandonment of the key-text, that about the seven kings), at that time the blockade of Jerusalem had not been formed; and so the description (xi. 2) of the capture of the city, and of the treading down of the outer court of the Temple by the Gentiles, must be owned to have been suggested by nothing which had then actually

occurred. It is idle to suppose, as some have done, that xvii. 16 refers to the burning of the Capitol, for that only took place in the subsequent contests between the parties of Vitellius and Vespasian: idle also to find references in the book to the assumption by Vespasian of miraculous power at Alexandria, or to his forbidding corn ships to sail to Rome: still more idle to find references to the supposed flight of Nero to Parthia. Take the book anywhere, and ask the interpreters to condescend to details, and point out how they are to be explained as referring to events in the reign of Galba, and they are at once at a loss. I have already referred to the discordance between interpreters of this school as to who is intended by the false prophet. Still less can they explain what is told about him. He works miracles; he brings fire down from heaven; he gives life to the image of the beast and makes it speak; he causes those that refuse to worship the beast's image to be killed; he causes all to receive the mark of the beast in their right hand or in their forehead; he permits no man to buy or sell who has not this mark.* Who is there at the date in question who can be described as having done, or as being thought likely to do, any of these things? Renan explains the prohibition to buy or sell as referring to the use of the imperial effigy on coins, which a strict Jew would think it idolatrous to use. Our Lord's question, 'Whose is this image and superscription?' may assure us that before the reign of Nero Jews had been asked to use such coins, and had made no scruple. Then again, who are the two witnesses (ch. xi.) from whose mouth fire proceeds to destroy their enemies, who have power to withhold rain and to smite the earth with other plagues, who are finally to be slain, and whose bodies are to lie three days and a-half in the streets of Jerusalem? I think that interpreters ought to be modest in their belief that they have got the right interpretation of the second verse of this chapter when

* Neither Farrar's nor Renan's explanation of this is so natural as that we have here a plain prediction of 'boycotting;' and sure enough ἀρνέλλος makes 666. But seriously, exclusion from ordinary traffic was a common result of the calumnies circulated against Christians (see the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Euseb. v. 1, a document which quotes the Apocalypse as Scripture).

they must own that their method will not carry them a single verse further. On the whole, it seems to me that Dr. Cumming could find quite as many coincidences to justify his methods of interpretation as those on which the more recent school relies.

But it has been supposed that a demonstration of the correctness of the latter methods is afforded by the fact that the numerical value of the letters of Nero Cæsar is 666, and that this is so unquestionably the right solution of the number of the beast, that we may regard Irenæus's ignorance of it as a proof that he knew nothing about the matter. It seems to me, on the contrary, that a man must know very little of the history of the interpretations of this number if he can flatter himself that because he has found a word the numerical value of whose letters makes the required sum he is sure of having the true solution. Pages might be filled with a list of persons whose names have been proposed as solutions of the problem. Among the persons supposed to be indicated are the emperors Caligula, Titus, Trajan, and Julian the Apostate, Genseric the Vandal, Popes Benedict IX. and Paul V., Mahomet, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Beza, Archbishop Laud, and Napoleon Bonaparte. There are three rules by the help of which I believe an ingenious man could find the required sum in any given name.* First, if the proper name by itself will not yield it, add a title; secondly, if the sum cannot be found in Greek, try Hebrew, or even Latin; thirdly, do not be too particular about the spelling. The use of a language different

* I remember that I once sent to Bishop Fitz Gerald a proof that 666 was the sum of the letters of the name of some opponent at the time, but was rash enough to add that I believed that no retaliation could be made either on his name or mine. In reply he presented me with the solution כּוֹר סִלְמוֹן; but he added the Horatian caution:—

> Tu ne quæsieris, quem mihi quem tibi
> Finem Di dederint, nec *Babylonios*
> Tentaris numeros.

Young computers must be warned against an error into which some have fallen, viz. that of confounding the 'Episemon,' which denotes six in the Greek arithmetical notation, either with the final sigma, or with the comparatively modern abbreviation for στ, which printers now use also for the Episemon, thereby so misleading simple readers, that I have found in

from that to which the name properly belongs allows a good deal of latitude in the transliteration. For example, if Nero will not do, try Cæsar Nero. If this will not succeed in Greek, try Hebrew; and in writing Kaisar in Hebrew be sure to leave out the Jod, which would make the sum too much by ten. We cannot infer much from the fact that a key fits the lock if it is a lock in which almost any key will turn. Irenæus, I think, drew a very sensible inference from the multiplicity of solutions which he was himself able to offer. He says (v. 30):—'It is safer therefore and less hazardous to await the event of the prophecy than to try to guess or divine the name, since haply the same number may be found to suit many names. For if the names which are found to contain the same number prove to be many, which of them will be borne by the coming one will remain a matter of inquiry.'

But it may be urged, that though we could not build much on the fact that the letters of Nero Cæsar make 666, yet the correctness of this solution is assured by its also giving the explanation of the number 616. But not to say that it shares this advantage with other solutions containing a name ending in *ων*, let us consider what is assumed when we lay stress on the fact that a single name gives the explanation of two different numbers. It is assumed that the answer to the riddle must have been better known than the riddle itself. There must have been a wide knowledge that Nero Cæsar was intended, and that the calculation was to be made in Hebrew letters, whereupon calculators who spelt the name differently adapted the number in their copies to the sum which they respectively brought out. But if there had been

---

a scientific article the information that the name of the numerical sign is Stau! It need hardly be said that no light is cast on the number 666 by observing how it looks when expressed in modern cursive characters. In extant uncial MSS. the number is written in words at length, and Irenæus appears to have so read it in his own MS., though he conjectures that the various reading 616 originated in MSS. where the number was written in letters. His words are (v. 30), 'Hoc autem arbitror scriptorum peccatum fuisse, ut solet fieri, quoniam et per literas numeri ponuntur, facile literam Graecam quae sexaginta enuntiat numerum, in iota Graecorum literam expansam.' (See Heumann in *Biblioth. Brem.*, I. p. 869; Godet, *Bibl. Studies*, *N. T.*, p. 353, Lyttleton's Transl.; Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, Bk. IV., c. xxviii. s. 5).

such widespread knowledge of the solution as is thus assumed, it is incredible that it should have been so completely lost when Irenæus tried to learn what was known of the matter by the disciples of John, and was quite sure that the calculation was to be made by Greek letters. I think, therefore, that no interpreter at the present day is justified in feeling the assurance, professed by some, that his solution is the only right one.

Although I find myself unable to believe that Irenæus could be entirely in error as to the whole object and drift of the Apocalypse, I do not see equal difficulty in the supposition that he might have been mistaken as to the date. I believe that it is an earlier book than the Gospel, both on account of the character of the Greek and for other reasons, on which see Westcott's Introduction (*Speaker's Commentary*, p. lxxxvi). Nor do I think the time soon after the death of Nero an improbable date. I am well disposed to adopt Renan's conjecture that St. John had been in Rome and witnessed the Neronian persecution, and that his book was written while the impression made by those scenes of blood was still fresh (Rev. xvii. 6; xviii. 20, 24; vi. 9, 10).

In what precedes, I had more than once (pp. 29, 252) had occasion to point out that inferences drawn from verses here and there in the Apocalypse fail to commend themselves, when the whole book is taken into consideration. Since these lectures were published, Vischer, a German theological student, has found a way of meeting these difficulties, which has been enthusiastically adopted by his teacher Harnack. Thus, it is hoped to reconcile the supposed narrow Judaism of part of the work with the universalism of chap. vii., and the Neronic date deduced from chaps. xi., xii., xiii., xvii., with the tradition which places the book in the reign of Domitian. The theory, in short, is that the book is composite, being in the main a purely Jewish Apocalypse written about the year 69, but edited, some quarter of a century later, by a Christian who has prefixed an introduction, added a conclusion, and made occasional interpolations. If we desire to know what was

the original Apocalypse, we are taught that we have nothing to do but strike out of our present text every phrase or sentence that betrays a knowledge of Christianity. It is not more difficult than that. In some cases the excision of a single phrase will suffice. Thus, for example, 'The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, *and of His Christ;*' 'Ye saints, *and ye apostles*, and ye prophets;' 'Which keep the Commandments of God, *and hold the testimony of Jesus;*' 'The song of Moses, *and the song of the Lamb*.' In all these cases we have only to strike out the words in italics. The rule, indeed, that the words 'the Lamb' must be struck out wherever they occur embarrasses us a little on their first introduction (v. 6), where the seals of the book are described as opened by 'a Lamb standing as though it had been slain.' When these words are struck out, who is left to open the seals? Vischer suggests, that v. 5 would lead us to think that what had stood in the original was a lion, not a lamb. In other cases whole verses have to be left out; for Christian verses will intrude themselves in the most improper places. For instance, the kernel of the whole composition is said to be chaps. xi. and xii., in which the purely Jewish character of the book is most unmistakeably manifested. Yet in chap. xi. there is a verse (*v.* 8) which must be cancelled as mentioning the city 'where our Lord was crucified;' and in chap. xii., another (*v.* 12), which Vischer likewise finds it necessary to strike out. I will not delay to speak of some longer passages which must be cancelled, such as v. 9–14, vii. 9–17, xiv. 1–5, and above all, the introduction consisting of three chapters. It is to be noted that, when these are removed, a fearful wound is made; for the original Jewish Apocalypse, as Vischer prints it, begins: 'After these things I saw, and behold a door opened in heaven; and the first voice which I heard, a voice as of a trumpet speaking with me.' It is clear that the original Apocalypse must have contained, if not our present introduction, some other introduction, and one agreeing with the present in including a verse like i. 10, in which mention is made of a voice like that of a trumpet. Vischer conjectures that the original introduction named as the seer one of the old prophets.

It is difficult to encounter an antagonist who comes arrayed in impenetrable armour, or it would be more correct to say, one who runs away from every blow. It is hard to refute a theorist who feels himself at liberty to reject as an interpolation every passage inconsistent with his theory. Mr. Chase has shown* that it can be demonstrated in the same way that the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is a purely Jewish document with a few Christian interpolations. I dare say it would be possible to set the epistles of Phalaris on their legs again, by striking out all the passages in which Bentley pointed out notes of modernness; and it would be worth the while of a Roman Catholic advocate to try whether, by judicious readiness to surrender every assailed position, he might not be able to find in the Decretal Epistles, after a few excisions had been made, a genuine collection of early Papal letters. True, he would have to face the objection that the Decretal Epistles exhibit complete unity of style; but Vischer has to encounter this same objection, for the very peculiar character of the Greek of the first three chapters pervades the entire book. So he modifies his hypothesis by the supposition that the original Apocalypse was in Aramaic, and that it is because the editor was translator as well, that we find his style impressed on the whole book. But the introduction is connected with what follows, not only by unity of style, but by several cross-references. Thus, compare ii. 7, xxii. 2; ii. 11, xx. 6, xxi. 8; ii. 16, xix. 21; ii. 17, xix. 12, xxii. 4; ii. 27, xix. 15, xii. 5; iii. 5, xx. 15; iii. 12, xxi. 10, xxii. 4; iii. 21, v. 6, xx. 4. Sabatier,† who points out these and other coincidences, though he has persuaded himself of the use of a Jewish document in the later chapters, finds it impossible to discover any breach of continuity in the earlier chapters of the book.

Vischer urges as an argument in favour of his hypothesis that the number of interpolations he is obliged to assume is extremely small; but this fact really tells the other way. For the writer of the first three chapters must surely have been a man of considerable fertility of imagination; and though we

* *Expositor*, III. v. 179.

† *Les origines littéraires et la composition de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, extrait de la Revue de théologie et de philosophie.

may admit it to be possible that in writing a book of prophetic visions he may have used ideas suggested to him by some previously published apocalypse, we cannot think it likely that he would have just slavishly copied that earlier book, merely throwing in a Christian phrase here and there. If it is said that, being himself a Jew by birth and training, and in habits of thought, he was quite satisfied with an apocalypse as Jewish as that which he has adapted, where is the impossibility of his having written it? The difficulty is increased when we find that the Christian editor is not anonymous. He claims to be, if not the Apostle John, as the Christian Church, from the time of Justin Martyr downwards has supposed, at least a personage well known to the Churches of Asia, to whom his letter was addressed. He tells them of visions which he had seen, and which our Lord in person had charged him to write in a book and send it to these Churches. The pronoun 'I' runs through the book, which closes by repeating the assertion that it was John himself who had seen these things and heard them. Previous critics who recognized in the book no divine revelation could at least think respectfully of the writer whose imagination had been fired in brooding over the great events of his time, and who sincerely believed himself to be commissioned to deliver a prophetic message. But now we are asked to think of him as a cold-blooded literary forger, who has got hold of the work of an earlier writer, and making some trivial changes in it, passes it off as his own. And what a terrible risk he ran! A Christian who found a Jewish apocalypse ascribed to Enoch, or Ezra, or Baruch, if he preserved the title, could, without much danger of exposure, add a few touches to improve the doctrinal teaching of the book. If the improved edition fell into the hands of one acquainted with the older form, it might not be difficult to persuade him that the fuller form was the genuine one. But it would be a very different thing if a reader detected that the revelations which John claimed to have seen and heard himself were nothing but transcripts from a work ascribed to one of the elder prophets. What should we think of anyone now who should copy verbatim the 6th of Isaiah, and publish it as an account of something that had

happened to himself? Or, since such conduct is scarce conceivable, what would be thought of the author of a book of travels, if it was discovered that whole pages had been copied from an earlier book of travels, and if all the adventures which the elder traveller had passed through were told as having happened to the younger. It would surely be said that he was an impostor who had never been in the countries which he described. Literary morality may not have been as strict in the first century as in the nineteenth; but it never could have been lax enough to tolerate plagiarism of the kind ascribed to St. John.

Sabatier's theory in some measure escapes this objection. He points out that the plan of the book is a scheme of seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials; and he considers that, as the opening of the seventh seal introduces the seven trumpets, so ought the sounding of the seventh trumpet to introduce the seven vials. But, in point of fact, between the sounding of the seventh trumpet (xi. 15) and the pouring out of the vials (*ch.* xvi.) there is a great interruption. We have interpolated (*ch.* xii.) the vision of the birth of the Messiah, the vision of the beast and the false prophet (*ch.* xiii.), and the judgment of the great whore (xvii., xviii.). This intrusive matter Sabatier regards as derived from an earlier non-Christian source; and he considers that the author has made sufficient acknowledgment of obligation in his account (x. 8) of a little book given him by an angel. Anyone who might chance to have been previously acquainted with the interpolated section would perceive that John did not give it as part of his own visions, but as the contents of the little book which he then received.

Now, in the first place, without laying any stress on the special character of the Apocalypse, it would be thought strange criticism even of a book of the present day if it were inferred that, because an author had not carried out his plans with perfect regularity, therefore he must be stealing his materials from some independent source. Why, the most eminent writers of fiction have complained that in the act of composition they lose command of their pen, which seems as if it had a will of its own: characters meant to be subordinate

assume a place not intended for them ; and what had been designed to be a mere episode swells into a principal part of the story. But it is more important to observe that the questioned chapters do not, as Vischer and Sabatier suppose, differ from the rest of the book, or betray a distinctly Judaic non-Christian character. Thus, for instance, we are told that the Messiah, born in the 12th chapter, is not Jesus Christ. I will not dwell on one supposed proof, which can be easily answered, viz.—that the Apocalypse deals with the future, and therefore that we cannot have here a Christian reference to a past event. But it is said that there is not a word about the Crucifixion or the historic life of Jesus. The Messiah is born, and then at once caught up to the throne of God. But it must be remembered that the chapter in the Apocalypse is symbolical: the scene is laid in heaven; so that we could not expect to read of the Crucifixion or any other event of our Lord's earthly life. But the whole conception of the 12th chapter is essentially Christian. It tells of a Messiah whose triumph is delayed, and whose course begins in persecution. This chapter occurs in that stage of the visions when the seventh trumpet has sounded, when, as we are told (x. 7), 'the mystery of God is finished, according to the good tidings which He declared to His servants the prophets.' The sounding of the trumpet is received with acclamation in heaven: 'The kingdom of this world is become the kingdom of our Lord' (xi. 15). Then comes the appearance of him who is 'to rule all nations with a rod of iron' (xii. 5). Surely if this had been a purely Jewish Apocalypse we should read of the Messiah coming in victory and triumph. Instead of that, he is only born as a child; he is persecuted with such violence that the woman who has borne him must flee into the wilderness; and, in order to preserve his own life, he must be caught up to the throne of God. It is not until chap. xix. 11 that we read of the coming of the Messiah *from heaven;* the whole description having many striking resemblances with the Christian expectation, as stated 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, that 'the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God.' It seems to me certain that no Jew, ignorant

of our Lord's history, would have formed such an expectation of the appearance of his Messiah as is presented in chap. xii.

Again, the section on the fall of Babylon is supposed to express only the undying animosity of the Jew against the Roman. There is something more: the animosity is against the city of Rome. We could understand a mere Jew being full of indignation against Roman domination, as exercised in his own land or in the provinces; but in this case it is in the city of Rome that 'is found the blood of prophets and of saints' (xviii. 24); 'this woman is drunk with the blood of the saints' (xvii. 6): see also xviii. 20. I have allowed Vischer to erase the mention of the blood of the martyrs of Jesus in xvii. 6; but it seems to me that the whole description is unintelligible if we suppose anything else referred to than the slaughter of Christians in the Neronic persecution. Jews were not persecuted for their religion by the Romans as they had been in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; certainly we know nothing of the kind as happening in Rome itself. I think we can also trace the hand of one who had personally visited Rome in the magnificent description (*ch.* xviii.) of the mercantile greatness of the city. We naturally think of Rome as the seat of empire; but I do not think it would have occurred to one who had not witnessed the throng of merchants and the abundance of all manner of precious things which they had brought in, to give such a description of Rome as might seem suitable only to a commercial city like Tyre.

Lastly, I do not understand how Vischer and Sabatier can reconcile with their system their adherence to what has now become the traditional rationalistic explanation of xi. 2, viz. that we have here a false prophecy that in the siege of Jerusalem the enemy should not succeed in capturing more than the outer court of the Temple which they were to hold for forty-two months. How those within were to be provisioned for that time we are not told. But, according to the theory of Vischer and Sabatier, we have in the Book of the Revelation a work published by a Christian who lived long enough after the siege of Jerusalem to know that the capture of the city, Temple and all, had been complete. If he found the verse xi. 2, as is alleged, in a previous

document he could not possibly have understood it, as do our modern interpreters, else he would have known the book to be a false prophecy, not worth the trouble he bestowed on it. He must, therefore, have interpreted the passage symbolically, and have regarded the temple that was measured as being not the material Temple in Jerusalem, but its prototype in heaven. And so likewise with the first readers of the book. If there had been, as Vischer imagines, a previous Apocalypse in Aramaic it must have been unknown to the first readers of the present book, otherwise our author would not have ventured to plagiarize from it so largely. These readers, every one of whom well knew that the Temple was utterly destroyed, could not have put the modern interpretation on this passage. What then can be more paradoxical than to hold that the only legitimate interpretation of a book is one that was not dreamed of, either by him who first published it, or by its first readers?

XV.

PART IV.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE QUARTODECIMANS.

I COME now to state another objection to the antiquity of the fourth Gospel, which has been repeated in tones of the utmost triumph, as if it were unanswerable. At least it used to be; but even the few years that I have been lecturing have been long enough to enable me to see the dying out of some objections that once were regarded as formidable. This argument, which I am now about to state, was not long since greatly relied on by the assailants of the Gospel; but now I think the more candid and cautious are inclined to abandon it as worthless. What the argument aims at proving is, that the Quartodecimans, who in the second century predominated in the Churches of Asia Minor, did not recognize the authority of the fourth Gospel, or own John as its author. Now since according to all the evidence, Asia Minor was the birthplace of that Gospel, and the place where its authority was earliest

acknowledged, the fact of its actual reception there is so well established, that it is natural to think there must be some flaw in an argument which undertakes to show by an indirect process that the Asiatic Churches *could* not have accepted it.

The objection is founded on a real difficulty in an apparent discrepancy between the fourth and the Synoptic Evangelists. In reading the first three Evangelists we feel no doubt that our Lord celebrated the feast of the passover on the night before He suffered. St. Matthew tells us expressly (xxvi. 17) that on the first day of unleavened bread our Lord sent the message—'My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with My disciples;' that the disciples did as Jesus commanded, and made ready the passover, and when the even was come Jesus sat down with the disciples. St. Mark (xiv. 12) adds that this was 'the day when they sacrificed the passover.' St. Luke closely agrees with St. Mark, and adds (xxii. 15) that our Lord said: 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' Thus, according to these three Evangelists, our Lord ate the passover on the evening of the first day of unleavened bread, and suffered the following day. St. John, on the other hand, tells us (xiii. 1) that the supper at which our Lord told the disciples that one of them should betray Him was 'before the feast of the passover.' When Judas leaves the room, the other disciples think that Jesus has commissioned him to buy the things that they had need of against the feast (xiii. 29), implying that the feast was still future. Next day the Jews refuse to enter the judgment-seat, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover (xviii. 28). Thus the impression left by John's narrative is, that Jesus did not eat the passover, but that He suffered on the first day of the feast, being Himself the true passover. Baur's theory is that one great object of St. John's Gospel was to bring out this point, that Christ was the true passover; and he quotes St. John's application (xix. 36) as a prophecy concerning Christ, of the law of the passover, 'neither shall ye break a bone thereof' (Ex. xii. 46, Num. ix. 12). It has been doubted whether the quotation is not rather from the

Psalms, from which John quotes so many other prophecies of Christ: 'He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken' (xxxiv. 20); but I am not inclined to dispute the reference to the passover, as to which Baur only expresses the general opinion of orthodox interpreters.

Now, that there is here a real difficulty I freely acknowledge; for there seems a force put on the words of John, if our Lord's Last Supper be made the passover supper, or else a force put on the words of the Synoptic Evangelists if it be not.* It probably requires only a fuller knowledge of some of the facts connected with the usages of the time to remove the discrepancy. The ancient authorities (the Bible, Josephus, and Philo) leave some points undetermined on which we desire information, while regulations cited from the Talmud are open to the doubt whether they are as ancient as our Lord's days. Without knowing, for example, what latitude the usages of that period permitted as to the time of holding the feast, we cannot tell whether to accept solutions which assume that the priests did not eat the passover at the same time as our Lord's disciples. Some have suggested that our Lord may have anticipated the time usual among the Jews, in order to partake of the feast with His disciples before He suffered; others adopt Chrysostom's conjecture that the Jewish rulers postponed their passover in their occupation with arrangements for the capture and trial of our Lord. It has been pointed out that what St. John tells of the scruple of the Jewish rulers to enter the Prætorium does not imply (as some have inferred) that the Evangelist meant his readers to regard this incident as having taken place on the morning of

* The view that the Last Supper was the passover is advocated, among recent writers, by Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 313; by M'Clellan, *Commentary*, p. 473; by Edersheim, *Life of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. p. 479. See also Dean Plumptre's Excursus in Ellicott's Commentary. The opposite view is maintained by Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 201; and by Westcott, *Introduction to Gospels*, p. 344; and in the *Speaker's Commentary*. This latter view was held by Clement of Alexandria, by Hippolytus, and by early Christian writers generally. Several quotations will be found in the Preface to the Paschal Chronicle (Bonn edit., p. 12), that from Clement being particularly interesting. But as on this point the earliest fathers had no more means of real information than ourselves, the opinion of a father has no higher authority than that of an eminent critic of our own day.

the day on which the passover was afterwards to be eaten. The passover would not be eaten till the evening; but before that time the defilement contracted by entering the heathen house could have been removed. Consequently it is urged that what the Jewish rulers proposed to eat must have been something to be partaken of immediately: either the passover proper, their regular celebration of which at an earlier hour that night had been interrupted, but of which they regarded themselves still in time to partake in the early morning on their return home from their interview with Pilate; or else the 'Chagigah,' a free-will offering made on the morning following the passover, but to which, according to competent authorities, the name 'passover' might be applied.

However, our present business is not to harmonize the Gospels, or remove their apparent inconsistencies. Such a work belongs to a later stage of the inquiry; and, as I said before, concerns Christians alone, and is one with which those who stand without have nothing to do. Critics, I think, overrate their knowledge of the Jewish usages of the time, who suppose themselves in a position to assert that there is a real disagreement between St. John and the other Evangelists. But what we have now to consider is whether, even supposing there be such a real disagreement, this makes it impossible to believe in the early date of St. John's Gospel. Now, to my mind, the conclusion is quite the reverse—this, and other seeming contradictions between St. John and the earlier Evangelists, being, as I think, inconsistent with the ascription of a late date to the Gospel. For let us suppose that the fourth Gospel was not written until after the other Gospels had had time to gain acceptance, and to be generally received among Christians as the authentic account of their Master's life; and is it conceivable that a forger, wishing to pass off his performance as the work of an Apostle, would have set himself in flagrant opposition to the general belief of Christians? John is quite silent about many most important events in our Lord's life: in fact, as a general rule, the things which he relates are the things not told in the former Gospels; yet he makes no mention of preceding writings, and does not

declare any intention of supplementing them. A forger would either have made a Gospel which he might hope to pass off as an independent complete account of the Saviour's life, or else he would profess to take the existing histories as his basis, and to supply what was wanting in them. And certainly the forger of a supplemental history would be cautious to dovetail his work properly into the accepted story. He would not venture, without a word of explanation, to make statements seemingly in direct contradiction to what the Church had received as the true Apostolic tradition. It seems to me, then, that the phenomena presented by the fourth Gospel can only be explained either by the hypothesis that it was published at so early a date that its writer was not aware of any necessity to take notice of other accounts of the Saviour's life; or else that it was written, as the Church has always believed it was, by an Apostle whose own authority stood so high that it was unnecessary for him to trouble himself to consider what others had said before him.

I believe that the latter explanation is the true one. All agree in placing the publication of John's Gospel so late that it is incredible but that other Gospels had previously been published, of which the writer could not be ignorant. No one whose own knowledge of our Lord's life was second-hand would have ventured to dispense with a careful study of the traditions which rested on the authority of his immediate followers; but it is quite conceivable that the person least likely to study what had been said by others would be one who was conscious that he needed not to learn the facts from any other, but could himself testify 'what he had heard, what he had seen with his eyes, what he had looked upon, and his hands had handled, of the Word of Life.'

I have now to explain how this discrepancy, real or apparent, between the Gospels, has been connected with the Easter controversies of the second century. There is still a good deal of uncertainty as to the exact point at issue in these disputes; but this much in general you are aware of, that the Churches of Asia Minor, where the Apostle John, according to the most trustworthy tradition, spent the last years of his life, celebrated their paschal solemnities on the

day of the Jewish Passover, the fourteenth day of the first month,* and that they cited the Apostle John as the author of this custom. The Churches of the West, and indeed of the rest of Christendom generally, held their paschal feast on the following Sunday, and continued their preliminary fast up to that Sunday, and after their Quartodeciman brethren had broken it off. There can be no doubt that the Western paschal feast was intended to commemorate the Resurrection of our Lord. In the Christian Church the weekly Resurrection feast was instituted before the annual feast; and it is plain that those who made their paschal feast coincide with their weekly celebration of the Resurrection did so in order to celebrate with peculiar joy that Lord's day which in the time of year most nearly approached to the time of His rising from the dead.

But what was the Eastern feast on the fourteenth day of the month intended to commemorate? The Tübingen school make answer, the Last Supper of the Lord. And then their argument proceeds thus:—The Asiatics commemorated the Last Supper on the fourteenth day of the month: they therefore adopted the reckoning of the Synoptic Gospels, according to which the Last Supper was held on the fourteenth, and the Passion took place on the following day.† And since the Churches of Asia cited John as the author of their custom, they must, if they knew the fourth Gospel, have rejected its claims to proceed from John the Apostle, since it apparently makes the fourteenth the day not of the Supper, but of the Passion. The whole argument, you will perceive, rests on the assumption that the Asiatic paschal feast was intended to commemorate the Last Supper; but where is the proof of that assumption? There is absolutely none.

* According to Exod. xii. 6, the passover was to be killed on the 14th day 'between the evenings.' Since the Jewish day, at least for ecclesiastical purposes, began with the evening, some have understood from this that the passover was to be killed on the beginning of the Jewish 14th day, or, as we should count it, on the evening of the 13th. But the best authorities are agreed that the passover was killed on the afternoon of the 14th, and eaten the following night. (Joseph., *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3.) In the passage cited Josephus speaks of the lamb as killed between the ninth and eleventh hours.

† That is, as we count days; but if the day is supposed to commence with the evening, the Last Supper and the Passion took place on the same day.

And now, perhaps, you may be inclined to dismiss the whole argument; for if one is at liberty to assume things without proof, it is shorter work to assume at once the thing you wish to establish, instead of professing to prove it by an argument, the premisses of which you take for granted without proof. However, as I have entered on the subject, I had better lay before you all that is known as to the details of these early Easter controversies. You will see that our information is so scanty that if we try to define particulars we are reduced to guessing. But it will appear, I think, that the Tübingen guess is a very bad one. In fact, what can be less probable than that the Asiatic Churches should make the Last Supper their one great object of annual commemoration, leaving the Crucifixion and the Resurrection uncelebrated?

There are three periods in the second century in which we hear of these paschal disputes. The earliest notice of the controversy is in the account given by Irenæus (Euseb. v. 24) of the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus, Bishop of Rome;* on which occasion we are told that neither could Anicetus prevail on Polycarp not to observe [the 14th Nisan] (*μὴ τηρεῖν*), inasmuch as he had always observed it with John the Apostle of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had associated; nor could Polycarp prevail on Anicetus to observe (*τηρεῖν*), for he said that he ought to follow the example of the presbyters before him. Here we see that the Eastern custom was 'to observe' the day: the Western, 'not to observe it.' The language of Irenæus is so vague, that it even leaves it an open question whether the Roman bishops before Soter had any Easter celebration at all, for he speaks of the difference between Anicetus and Polycarp as more funda-

* This visit probably took place about the Easter of A.D. 154; for a later date would not fall within the life of Polycarp, nor an earlier within the episcopate of Anicetus. There is no evidence that Polycarp visited Rome in order to confer on the question of Easter celebration; and probably the diversity of practice between East and West was only revealed through the occurrence of the festival during the time of Polycarp's visit. It is likely that the object of that visit was in order that the Gnostic pretence to have derived their peculiar doctrines by secret Apostolic tradition might be refuted by the testimony of an actual survivor from the Apostolic generation. (See Iren. iii. 3.)

mental than that involved in the Easter disputes of his own times. At any rate, we are not told in what way the Easterns observed the day, nor in commemoration of what. No argument seems to have been used on either side but the tradition of the respective Churches. It does not appear that any question of doctrine was involved: and Polycarp and Anicetus parted on the terms of agreeing to differ, Anicetus even in token of respect yielding to Polycarp the office of consecrating the Eucharist in his Church.

It seems to me likely that Polycarp was right in thinking that the most ancient Christian paschal celebrations did coincide in time with the Jewish. We know that the days of the week on which our Lord suffered and rose from the dead were ever kept in memory by the Church, and were celebrated from the earliest times; but there is no trustworthy tradition as to the days of the year on which these events occurred. Our complicated rules for finding Easter serve to attest that among nations whose calendar was governed by the solar year, the annual celebration of our Lord's death and resurrection did not begin until so long after the events that the day of the year on which they occurred was not certainly known. We know, however, from the Acts, that Christians of Jewish birth continued to ob serve the customs of their nation, including, doubtless, the passover. And not merely the Judaizing Christians, but Paul himself. For in addition to what we elsewhere read of his compliance with Jewish institutions, we have plain indications of his keeping this feast at Philippi, when St. Luke tells us (Acts xx. 6) that they sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, St. Paul's wish at the time being to keep the next great Jewish feast, that of Pentecost, at Jerusalem. He says, also, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (xvi. 8):—'I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.' But we cannot doubt, either, that when the Apostles kept the passover feast they would give it a Christian aspect. The very first recurrence of that season could not but bring vividly before their minds all the great events which the preceding passover had witnessed. Now this is quite independent of any theory as to the day of the month on which

our Lord suffered. If we suppose that He suffered on the fifteenth, then the Apostles' celebration of the passover feast would, doubtless, especially remind them of the last occasion on which the Lord had eaten the same feast with them; if we suppose that He suffered on the fourteenth, their passover feast would equally call to memory the death of Him who was the true Passover. To myself it seems certain, that—since the great difference between East and West was that the East only celebrated one day, the West a whole week, commemorating the Crucifixion and Resurrection on different days—the Eastern paschal feast must have included a recollection of all the events of this great season. We find very early traces that the feast was preceded by a fast; and it is scarcely credible that, as the Tübingen theory demands, Christians would have fasted up to the day before their anniversary of the Crucifixion, and then changed their mourning into joy on that which had been at first a day of mourning and sorrow.

Wherever Jewish Christians formed a large part of a Church, the time of their paschal feast would naturally coincide with that of the Jews, though the mode of celebration might be different. The Christians would, no doubt, make their commemoration of the Lord's death in that rite by which He Himself instructed them to show it forth. But they probably agreed with the Jews in the use of unleavened bread at this season; for I would understand Paul as giving a spiritual interpretation to an already existing custom, when he says (1 Cor. v. 7), 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.' While the time of celebration where Jews were numerous naturally coincided with that of the Jewish passover, it no less naturally was independent of it where Jews were few. Afterwards, when the hostility between Jews and Christians became more intense, it was made a point to celebrate on a different day from the Jews; and to this seems to be owing the rule, which we still observe, that if the full moon falls on a Sunday, Easter is not till the Sunday after.

The second time at which we hear of paschal disputes is about the year 170, when we are told that there was much disputing on this subject at Laodicea; and that the celebrated Melito of Sardis wrote a book on this subject. The occasion of it appears to have been that a leading Christian named Sagaris suffered martyrdom at Laodicea on the 14th Nisan; and that when in the following year great numbers of Christians came together thither from different cities in order to celebrate the anniversary of his death, the diversity of their Easter usages arrested attention and excited controversy. Eusebius, who tells us so much (iv. 26), has not preserved enough of Melito's writings to inform us of the particulars of the dispute; but we know otherwise that Melito was a Quartodeciman as being one of the leading bishops of Asia Minor. There are, however, two short fragments purporting to come from another celebrated contemporary bishop of the same district, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, these fragments having been preserved by an anonymous writer of the sixth century.* In these Apollinaris argues that our Lord suffered on the 14th. He evidently used St. John's Gospel, for he refers to the water and blood which came from our Lord's side. It is much disputed whether, as the Tübingen school assert, Apollinaris was one of a minority in Asia Minor who had been converted to the Western custom, and who wrote in opposition to Melito; or whether he and Melito were on the same side—both Quartodecimans, and only contending with those who set on wrong grounds the celebration of the 14th day. For our purpose it is immaterial to decide the question. At this stage of the controversy the arguments did not rest merely on traditional custom, but Scripture was appealed to. And Apollinaris argues from St. John's Gospel that the 14th was the day on which our Lord suffered, and accuses those who held the opposite theory of so interpreting the Gospels as to set them at variance with each other. It is evident that at this time the authority of St. John's Gospel was recognized by the Quartodecimans; of which we have a further proof in the fact that Melito counted our Lord's ministry as lasting

* Paschal Chron. (Bonn edit.), p. 12; Routh, *Rell. Sac.* i. 160.

for three years,* a deduction which cannot be made from the Synoptic Gospels without the help of John's.

The third stage of the dispute was at the end of the century, when Victor of Rome excommunicated the Asiatic Churches for retaining their ancient customs. In excuse for Victor it must be said that trouble had been caused him by a presbyter of his own Church, Blastus, who wanted to introduce the Quartodeciman practice at Rome. A man might be very tolerant of the usages of a foreign Church as long as they were kept at a distance, but might think himself bound to put them down when they were schismatically introduced into his own Church.† Victor was boldly resisted by Polycrates, in a letter, of which a most interesting fragment is preserved by Eusebius (v. 24). In this Polycrates appeals in defence of the Asiatic custom to 'John, who leaned on the Lord's breast' at supper. I need not remind you that this description of John is derived from the fourth Gospel. Thus, it seems to me that the appeal which has been made to the Quartodeciman controversy, instead of being unfavourable to the authority of the fourth Gospel, really establishes its great antiquity. The only two Quartodeciman champions of whom we know anything, Melito and Polycrates, both owned the authority of that Gospel. To these I am inclined to add Apollinaris; but if the Tübingen school are right in saying that he was not one of the Quartodecimans, and that he used St. John's Gospel in arguing against them, at least he does so without any suspicion that its authority would be questioned by his opponents. In fact, if it could be shown that the fourth Gospel was at variance with Quartodeciman celebration, the fact of its reception by the leading men of that party would prove that the authority of that Gospel must have been well established

---

* This appears from a passage preserved by Anastasius Sinaita: see Routh, *Reli. Sac.* i. 121.

† The Catholics generally looked on the Quartodecimans as quarrelsome people who schismatically refused to conform to the custom of the rest of the Christian world. Thus Hippolytus (*Ref.* viii. 18) describes them as φιλόνεικοι τὴν φύσιν, ἰδιῶται τὴν γνῶσιν, μαχιμώτεροι τὸν τρόπον; and Athanasius, quoted in the Paschal Chronicle (p. 9, Bonn edit.), as φιλονεικοῦντες, ἐφευρόντες ἑαυτοῖς ζητήματα, προφάσει μὲν τοῦ σωτηριώδους πάσχα, ἔργῳ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας ἔριδος χάριν μάλιστα.

before the Quartodeciman disputes arose, else those against whom it was used in controversy would surely have questioned its authority, had there been any ground for suspicion.

I have said that it is more than doubtful whether it was at all essential to the Quartodeciman system to count the 15th as the day of the Saviour's Passion; but in any case it is absurd to suppose that those who so computed denied the authority of the fourth Gospel. This very point is disputed by harmonists to this day: some decide for the 14th, some for the 15th; and yet we know that the one party and the other alike admit John's Gospel and Matthew's as of equal authority.

NOTE.

Astronomical calculations have been used to determine the day of the Jewish month on which our Lord suffered. We may assume it as certain that He suffered on a Friday. I am aware that Canon Westcott (*Gospels*, p. 345) offers arguments in support of the view that the day was Thursday; but the point is one on which it does not seem to me possible that Christian tradition should go wrong. If this day was the 15th Nisan, so also must the 1st of Nisan have been Friday. In that case, therefore, the year must have been one in which the passover month began on a Friday. On the other hand, if it was on the 14th He suffered, the 15th, and consequently the 1st of the month, must have been Saturday. Now among the Jews, the evening when the new moon was first visible in the heavens would be the commencement of a new month. Astronomical tables enable us to determine for any month the time of 'conjunction:' that is to say, the moment when absolutely nothing but the dark side of the moon was turned towards the earth. At that moment, of course, it would be invisible, and it would not be until about thirty hours afterwards that the crescent of the young moon might be seen after sunset.

I had computed the new moons for the possible years of the Passion, using simple rules given by De Morgan in his *Book of Almanacs*, when I found that the table had been already given in Wieseler's *Synopsis* (p. 407, Cambridge ed.) from a calculation made by a German astronomer, Wurm; and I have since found that the same computation had been made for Mr. M'Clellan by Professor Adams (see M'Clellan's *Commentary, N. T.*, p. 493). The year A.D. 29 is that which Hippolytus supposed to be that of the Passion; and this date was adopted by many subsequent fathers. I have already mentioned (p. 201) that Hippolytus used an erroneous table of full moons, which led him to fix the date of the Passion as March 25th. But that was so many days after the actual

occurrence of the full moon, that it is inconceivable the passover could have been kept on that day; and, from the considerations that have been just explained, it can be inferred that the Passion did not take place on any day in that year. The astronomical new moon took place about eight in the evening of Saturday, April 2nd. On Sunday night the moon would be too young to be visible; but on Monday night it would be forty-six hours' old, when it could not fail to be seen, so that that evening would be pretty sure to be the first of the month. The month could not possibly begin either on Friday or Saturday. But in the year 30 the conjunction took place at eight in the evening of Wednesday, March 22nd, and we infer in the same way that the month began on Friday the 24th. This, therefore, is a possible year of the Passion. Proceeding in like manner, we find that the month began in 31 on a Tuesday, and in 32 on a Monday. In 33, however, the conjunction took place at one on the afternoon of Thursday, March 19th. At six o'clock next evening the moon would be 29 hours' old, and probably would be visible; but it is possible it might not have been observed till Saturday evening. Similar arguments lead us to reject the year 28, but admit 27 as a possible year, in which case the day would be Friday. The following table exhibits the date of new moon and the probable first day of the passover month for the years A.D. 27–36:—

A.D.	Time of true New Moon.	Moon first visible.
27.	March 26, 8 P.M., ...	Friday, March 28.
28.	March 15, 2 A.M., ...	Tuesday, March 16.
29.	April 2, 8 P.M., ...	Monday, April 4.
30.	March 22, 8 P.M.	Friday, March 24.
31.	March 12, 1 A.M., ...	Tuesday, March 13.
32.	March 29, 11 P.M., ...	Monday, March 31.
33.	March 19, 1 P.M., ...	Friday, March 20, or Saturday, March 21.
34.	March 9, 9 A.M., or April 7, 1 P.M., ...	Wednesday, March 10. Thursday, April 8, or Friday, April 9.
35.	March 28, 6 A.M., ...	Tuesday, March 29.
36.	March 16, 6 P.M., ...	Sunday, March 18.

The year 30 is that which Wieseler looks on as the probable year of the Passion; and since in that year the passover month began on a Friday, he concludes that our Lord suffered on the 15th Nisan, as the Synoptic Gospels would lead us to suppose. But everything turns on the question, How did the Jewish days commence? Caspari (*Chronological and Geographical Introduction to Life of Christ*, Edinb., 1876, pp. 17, 196) has pointed out that if the Jewish days began with the evening, the conclusion is just the opposite of what Wieseler supposed. For the appearance of the moon on Friday evening was on that supposition the beginning, not the end, of the first day of the month, which would include Saturday. The 15th Nisan, therefore, was also a Saturday, and the day of the Passion

(assuming it to have been a Friday) must have fallen on the 14th, which was 7th April. On the other hand, it is urged that Josephus, in the passage cited (Note, p. 267), speaks of the lamb as killed between the 9th and 11th hours, from which language it is inferred that though, for religious purposes, the day began with the evening, yet in ordinary Jewish language the day was counted as beginning in the morning.

XVI.

PART V.

THE GOSPEL AND THE MINOR EPISTLES.

THE result at which I arrived (p. 243), from a comparison of the diction of the Gospel and the Apocalypse, left it an open question whether the former were written by the author of the latter, or by a disciple of his. To-day I propose to make a further examination of the contents of the Gospel, with the view of obtaining, if possible, a more definite conclusion.*

I. The author of the fourth Gospel was a Jew.

(1) I remark, in the first place, the familiarity with the Old Testament which he exhibits. Quotations from it occur as frequently as in what has been regarded as the Jewish Gospel, St. Matthew's; and in two or three cases they are made directly from the Hebrew, not the Septuagint. These cases are, the passage from the 41st Psalm (xiii. 18), 'He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me,' and that (xix. 37) from Zechariah xii. 10, 'They shall look on him whom they pierced.' The prophecy also (Isaiah vi. 9, 10) which is so often referred to in the New Testament, and which is quoted by St. Matthew (xiii. 14) nearly in the words of the Septuagint, appears in quite a different rendering in St. John (xii. 40).

---

* In this lecture I chiefly reproduce the arguments of Dr. Sanday (*Fourth Gospel*, ch. 19), with the additions made to them by Professor Westcott in the Introduction to his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*. I also make use of an appendix added by Renan to the 13th edition of his *Vie de Jésus*, in which he justifies the preference he had expressed (see p. 212) for the narrative as given in the fourth Gospel.

(2) Next I note his acquaintance with the Jewish feasts. It is remarkable that this Evangelist (said to be anti-Jewish) has alone recorded our Lord's attendance at these feasts, and has used them as land-marks to divide the history. It is in this way we learn, what we should not have found from the Synoptic Gospels, that our Lord's public ministry lasted more than one year. Three passovers are directly mentioned (ii. 13, 23; vi. 4; xiii. 1, xviii. 28); besides another feast, named generally 'a feast of the Jews' (v. 1), with respect to which commentators are divided whether or not it was a passover. The feast of Tabernacles is spoken of with a note that the last was the 'great day of the feast' (vii. 37), and this verse contains what seems a plain allusion to the rite, practised at this feast, of pouring forth water from the pool of Siloam. Mention is likewise made of that feast of the later Jews, instituted without any express divine command, which commemorated the dedication of the Temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes (x. 22).

(3) In connexion with the preceding, I note the acquaintance shown with Jewish customs and habits of thought. There are, for instance, repeated references to the customs in connexion with purification: the 'waterpots after the manner of the purifying of the Jews' (ii. 5); the question about purifying between John's disciples and the Jews (iii. 25); the coming up of Jews to Jerusalem, previous to the passover, in order to purify themselves (xi. 55); the fear of our Lord's accusers to defile themselves, previous to the passover, by entering the heathen Prætorium (xviii. 28); and the Jewish scruple against allowing the bodies to remain on the cross on the Sabbath day (xix. 31). We learn, moreover, from St. John (what other testimony confirms) that baptism was not a rite newly instituted by John the Baptist, but one known to the Jews before; for the question is not put to the Baptist (i. 25), What is this new thing that thou doest? but he is asked why he baptized, seeing that he claimed for himself no official position, neither to be the Christ, nor Elias, nor 'the prophet.' Then, again, the Evangelist, in his well-known narrative (ch. iv.), shows his knowledge of the state of feeling between the Jews and Samaritans (see also viii. 48); he is familiar with current

Rabbinical and popular notions, as, for instance, concerning the connexion between sin and bodily suffering, in the question (ix. 2), 'Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?'; as to the importance attached to the religious schools (vii. 15); the disparagement of the 'dispersion' (vii. 35); and with the Rabbinical rule against holding converse with a woman (iv. 27). I have already had occasion to notice one passage which has been a terrible stumbling-block in the way of those who would ascribe the book to a Gnosticizing Gentile of the second century. In the very passage where the claims of spiritual religion, apart from any distinction of place and race, are most strongly set forth, the prerogatives of the Jew are asserted as strongly as they are by St. Paul himself when he has to answer the question, 'What advantage then hath the Jew?' This Gospel puts into our Lord's mouth the words (iv. 22), 'Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews.' If these words be invention, assuredly they are not a Gentile or a Gnostic invention (see also p. 208).

I do not present the argument from the language, because to enter into details would make it necessary to discuss what phrases can positively be asserted to be Hebraisms; but the whole colouring of the diction, and still more of the thoughts, is essentially Hebrew.*

The best argument† that can be used in opposition to those I have produced is that founded on the constant use of the phrase 'the Jews,' which seems to imply that the writer was not a Jew. But the use of the phrase presents no difficulty when we remember the late date of the Gospel, and that it was written in a Greek city where 'the Jews' were in all probability the bitterest adversaries of the Christian Church. I need only refer to the hard things said of

* For proofs, see Sanday, p. 289; Westcott, pp. vii., li.

† The description of Caiaphas as 'high-priest that year' (xi. 49, 51; xviii. 13) does not oblige us to suppose the writer to be so ignorant of Jewish affairs as to imagine the high-priesthood to be an annual office. All that the words assert is, that in that year when 'one man died for the people,' Caiaphas was the high-priest. The repeated changes made by the government in the high-priesthood at this time are mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 2, 2).

'the Jews' many years before by St. Paul (1 Thess. ii. 14–16), who more than any other gloried in being able to call himself a Jew (see p. 30).*

II. The writer was a Jew of Palestine.

We may infer this from his minute acquaintance with the topography of the Holy Land. Thus he knows the small town Cana of Galilee (ii. 1, 11; iv. 46; xxi. 2), a place not noticed by any earlier writer: Bethsaida, the native place of Philip, Peter, and Andrew (i. 44); Bethany beyond Jordan (i. 28), for this seems to be the true reading instead of Bethabara, of the common text; he knows the exact distance from Jerusalem of the better known Bethany (xi. 18); he knows the city Ephraim near the wilderness (xi. 54); Ænon† near to Salim, where John baptized (iii. 23); Sychar the city of Samaria, where Jacob's well was, of which the Evangelist tells that the 'well is deep' (iv. 11), as indeed it is, more than a hundred feet; he knows the whole aspect of the place; the mountain where the Samaritans worshipped, that is to say, Mount Gerizim, which rises to a sheer height of eight hundred feet above the village, and where the remains of a temple are still visible; and he knows the rich corn-fields at the base of the mountain (*v.* 35).‡

There is the same familiarity with the topography of Jerusalem. He speaks of Bethesda, the pool near the sheep gate, having five porches; of the treasury at the Temple; of Solomon's porch; of the pool Siloam, which name he correctly derives as the 'sending forth' of waters; of the brook

* In John vii. 1, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι seems to mean the inhabitants of Judæa as opposed to the Galileans, a use of the word natural enough in a Galilean writer. The word will bear this meaning in most of the passages where it occurs in this Gospel, of course setting those aside where the word would in any case be used in a book intended for Gentile readers, as, for instance, where customs or feasts of 'the Jews' are spoken of. But vi. 41, 52, will not admit this interpretation, since it is not said that the objectors were visitors from Judæa.

† On this Renan remarks, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 492, 'On ignore, il est vrai, où était Salim; mais Αἰνών est un trait de lumière. C'est le mot Ænawan, pluriel Chaldéen de Ain ou Æn, "fontaine." Comment voulez-vous que des sectaires hellénistes d'Ephèse eussent deviné cela? Ils n'eussent nommé aucune localité, ou ils en eussent nommé une très-connue, ou ils eussent forgé un mot impossible sous le rapport de l'étymologie sémitique.'

‡ See Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, ch. v., ii., p. 240, 2nd edit.

Kedron; of the place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew Gabbatha; of the place of the skull, called in Hebrew Golgotha. I would also notice the graphic description of the aspect of the Temple on the occasion of its cleansing by our Lord; the animals for sacrifice, sheep, oxen, and doves, crowding its courts; and the money-changers, who are described as sitting, the sellers of the animals naturally standing.

Now even a single topographical reference may give a revelation of the writer's nationality. I remember, at the beginning of the Crimean war, when we knew nothing here of the authorship of the brilliant war correspondence which began to appear in the *Times*, how a comparison, in one of the early letters, of some scenery to that of 'the Dargle,' suggested to us the inference, This writer must be an Irishman. If a novel appeared in which the scene was laid in Ireland, and mention freely made of small Irish localities, and of different Dublin public buildings, we should feel little doubt that the writer was either an Irishman, or one who had spent some time in Ireland; and yet I need not say how much easier it is now, than in the days when the Gospel was written, for a writer to get up from books the details which would add verisimilitude to his narrative.

The work of a native of Palestine may also be recognized in the knowledge of local jealousies which the writer exhibits. One outside a country thinks little of the distinctions between different provinces. But here we seem to have a picture drawn by a Galilean who had smarted under the haughty contempt with which the inhabitants of Jerusalem regarded his province: 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' (i. 46). 'Shall Christ come out of Galilee?' (vii. 41). 'Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet' (vii. 52). Note also the scorn of the rulers and the Pharisees for the opinion of the vulgar: 'This people who knoweth not the law are cursed' (vii. 49).

Further, the writer is as familiar with the history of the Temple as with its external aspect. One of the data used at present in calculating the chronology of our Saviour's ministry is the remark recorded by St. John (ii. 20), 'Forty and six

years was this Temple in building.' Counting the commencement of the forty-six years from the time recorded by Josephus, we obtain a date for our Lord's ministry in close agreement with what we are led to by other considerations. But is it credible either that a forger in the second century, when the science of chronology was unknown, could have had the information rightly to state the interval between the beginning of the Temple building and our Lord's ministry, or, that if he had made a random guess, he could have hit the truth so accurately?

III. I come next to the question, It having been thus proved that the writer was a Jew, was he a Jew of the first or of the second century? And this question is not difficult to answer, for the subjects which engage interest, and which excite controversy, differ from age to age. Even in the lifetime of one man they change. Compare Paul's earlier Epistles with his later, compare the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians with those to Timothy and Titus, and you will find that the controversy about justification with or without the works of the law, which is the main subject of the earlier Epistles, is hardly alluded to in the later. This is one of the tests by which was exposed the forgery of the Decretal Epistles ascribed to the early Popes, that the controversies and topics with which these letters deal are not those of the centuries when the alleged writers lived, but those of the ninth century, when the letters were really written. Now, test the fourth Gospel in this way, and you will find that the controversies with which it deals, and the feelings which it assumes, are those of the first century not the second. The Messianic idea that pervades the Gospel is not that which prevailed after the Gnostic heresies arose, but that which existed before Jerusalem was destroyed, when the Jews still expected the Messiah to be a deliverer who should establish a temporal sovereignty and make the Jews the rulers of the surrounding nations. This Evangelist tells us, what we do not learn from the Synoptic Gospels, that the impression produced by the miracle of feeding the multitude was such that they were about to come by force to make our Lord a king, evidently believing that they had now found him who

would lead them against the Romans, and victoriously restore the kingdom to Israel. And we are told that our Lord was obliged to withdraw Himself from their importunity to a mountain alone. It was because He refused to proclaim a 'kingdom of this world' that the Jews found it hard to own as their Messiah one who, though He could preach and heal, yet seemed unable to bring them the deliverance or the glory which they desired. St. John represents the prudent Jewish rulers as resolved to put down the prophesying of Jesus, because they feared that the political consequences of His assertion of His kingdom would be an unsuccessful revolt against foreign rule, the result of which would be that the Romans would come and take away their place and nation (xi. 48). And St. John brings out with great clearness the fact that it was as a pretender to temporal sovereignty that Jesus was accused before Pilate, who, though personally inclined to dismiss the complaint, was withheld from doing so through fear of exciting the jealousy of his own emperor by his remissness, if in such a matter as this he showed himself 'not Cæsar's friend' (xix. 12). Remember that the state of Jewish feeling which I have described was quelled by the destruction of Jerusalem, and judge whether it is probable that a writer of the next century would have been able to throw himself into the midst of these hopes and feelings, and to reproduce them as if they were part of the atmosphere which he had himself breathed.*

Then, again, the topics introduced are those which were discussed in our Lord's time, and not a hundred years afterwards. For example, what Gnostic of the second century would have cared to discuss a breach of the Sabbath, and to inquire when the duty of Sabbath observance (admitted to be the general rule) was overborne by a higher obligation?

* The argument in this paragraph, which had been forcibly urged by Sanday (p. 291) has been parried by the remark that in Barcochba's rebellion, in the reign of Hadrian, there was a revival of Jewish nationalist and anti-Roman feeling. But the argument at least obliges us to choose between the accepted date of the Gospel and a date later than A.D. 135, when Barcochba's rebellion was put down. And even leaving out of sight the use made of the Gospel by Justin Martyr, I cannot reconcile so late a date with the other indications mentioned above.

See, again, how familiar the writer is with the expectations which before our Lord's coming the Jews had formed of what their Messiah was to be. He was not to be from Galilee: 'Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?' (vii. 42); 'We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever' (xii. 34); 'We know this man whence he is, but when Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is' (vii. 27); 'When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?' (vii. 31).

On the other hand, the writer shows no knowledge of the controversies raised by the Gnostic heresies which broke out early in the second century. The problem that most occupied the minds of the Gnostic speculators was how to account for the origin of evil, and the solution they generally agreed in offering was that evil was inherent in matter. It followed that the creation of matter could not have been the work of the good God; and since the God of the Jews claimed the work of creation as his own, that he must be a being different from, and, according to many systems, hostile to, the Supreme God. Thus the authority of the Old Testament was rejected. Further, those who held these views found it impossible to believe that the Saviour could have assumed a material body, and so they were led to maintain that in His earthly life He was only in appearance like other men. Again, they could not believe that the existence of matter would be prolonged beyond the present life, and so they rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. And as they conceived that perfection was to be attained through release from the dominion of matter, they inculcated an ascetic mode of life, abstinence from animal food and from wine, as well as from marriage, through which the material life is perpetuated. Now it is not merely that the fourth Evangelist gives no countenance to any of these theories, but he shows no sign that he had ever heard of them. He is an unsuspicious monotheist, and the theory of two independent principles is one that it as little occurs to him to refute as to hold. He is an equally

unsuspicious believer in the Divine authority of the Old Testament. I have given some proofs of this (p. 207), but what is chiefly important to observe is, that while the Evangelist feels the controversy with Judaism pressing, the controversy with Gnosticism does not exist for him. He is solicitous to maintain that Jesus was 'He of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write;' and he seems to have no idea that our Lord's claims could have been set on any other foundation. No question as to the lawfulness of marriage is raised; but Jesus is represented as gracing a wedding feast with his presence. Controversies as to the use of animal food and as to the ascetic life, though known to St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 2; 1 Cor. vii.; 1 Tim. iv. 3), do not appear to have been raised in the circle for which the fourth Evangelist wrote. The resurrection of the body is plainly taught (v. 28); for the future life is not represented as resulting from the continuance of the soul, though separated from the body; but 'they that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth.' Yet he is so little solicitous to maintain the doctrine controversially, that, as I have already mentioned (p. 210), there have been those who have imagined that he has no other idea of eternal life than of that the possession of which is present. Jesus is represented as having a body subject to the accidents of weariness and thirst, and which even after His resurrection His disciples might handle (John xx. 27; 1 John i. 1). Yet in the Gospel the Evangelist shows little anxiety to combat a Docetic theory of our Lord's person, and tells without scruple some things which might seem to favour such a theory, as, for example, the appearance of our Lord to His disciples when the doors were shut. But it would seem that when the Epistle was written Docetism had become formidable enough to need express condemnation; and then the denial that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh was pronounced to emanate from the spirit of antichrist (1 John iv. 3; 2 John 7). In sum, then, the fourth Evangelist proves himself not to be a second century writer, by his utter want of interest in the controversies which stirred the Christian Church early in the second century.

IV. I regard it, then, as proved that the writer of the fourth Gospel was a Jew, not very distant in time from the events which he relates. Is there, then, any reason why we should refuse credence to the claim, which he himself makes four times, to have been an eyewitness of our Saviour's life? (i. 14, xix. 35, xxi. 24; 1 John i. 1). There is nothing against admitting this claim, but everything in favour of it. It is quite remarkable how frequently the Evangelist throws himself into the position of the original disciples, and repeats their reflections or comments; these being such as, though appropriate at the time, would not be likely to have occurred to one who was not himself a disciple. There are three instances in the very second chapter. The effect of the miracle of the turning the water into wine is said to have been that His 'disciples believed on Him' (*v.* 11). Again, 'His disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up' (*v.* 17). Again, 'when therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said' (*v.* 22). Why is this prominence given to the reflections of the disciples? Is it likely that a forger of the second century, who wished to exhibit the glory of the Logos, would say, what sounds so like a truism, that His disciples believed on Him? If they had not, they would not have been disciples. It would surely have been more to the point to tell the effect upon the guests: and a forger would hardly have failed to do this. But all is explained when we suppose that a disciple is speaking, and recording how that favourable impression produced by the testimony of the Baptist, which had disposed him to join the company of Jesus, was changed by this miracle into actual faith. I leave other instances of the same kind to be traced out by yourselves, only taking notice now of one of them: how we are told that the disciples who took part in the triumphal entry of Palm Sunday understood not at the time what they had been doing, but, after Jesus was glorified, 'remembered that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him' (xii. 16).*

* It harmonizes curiously with this remark that Mark (xi. 1) and Luke

I think we may also conclude that the writer had been a disciple of the Baptist as well as of our Lord. This appears from the fulness of the opening chapter, which deals with the Baptist's ministry, and which is best explained if we suppose the Evangelist to be the unnamed disciple who, together with Andrew, heard the testimony, 'Behold the Lamb of God.' And if the Evangelist had heard the story from another he would scarcely have added the minute detail that it was the tenth hour of the day when the conversation with Jesus took place. We trace the work of a disciple of the Baptist in more than one subsequent allusion to that testimony, and, above all, in one remarkable periphrasis, which is undoubtedly what no forger would have imagined, 'Jesus went away beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and there He abode; and many resorted unto Him and said, John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true' (x. 41). To describe the place of Jesus' sojourn as the place where John *at first* baptized, and to record the impressions of those who had been affected by the Baptist's teaching, and were hesitating whether or not they should attach themselves to Jesus, would not naturally occur to anyone who had not himself moved in the same circle. Indeed, the prominence given to the Baptist in the fourth Gospel is in itself a proof how near the writer was to the events which he records. A modern reader seldom realizes the importance of the work done by the Baptist in preparing the way of Jesus. Yet the Synoptic Gospels tell of the reputation and influence gained by John (Matt. xiv. 5, Mark vi. 20, Luke xx. 6; cp. Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3). They tell also that there was such a connexion between John and his successor, that any who acknowledged the divine mission of the Baptist would be bound in consistency to own the authority of Jesus (Matt. xxi. 25, Mark xi. 31, Luke xx. 5). The fourth Gospel explains fully what the connexion was, by telling that it was among the disciples of the Baptist that

(xix. 29) relate our Lord's triumphal entry without noting that it was a fulfilment of prophecy; whence we may probably infer, that if these two Evangelists used an earlier document, it too contained no reference to the prophet Zechariah. It is Matthew who first appeals to the prophecy (xxi. 4).

Jesus first gained followers, who joined Him in consequence of the testimony borne to Him by John. This testimony is again referred to as furnishing part of the credentials of Jesus (v. 32, 33). But we have no reason to think that in the second century John occupied such a place in the minds of men as would lead a forger to lay such stress on his authority.

Other notes of autoptic testimony are the minute particulars of time, and place, and persons, that are mentioned; that such a discourse took place in Solomon's porch (x. 23); such another in the treasury (viii. 20); another, as I mentioned a moment ago, at the tenth hour; another (that with the woman of Samaria) at the sixth (iv. 6); that such another miracle was performed at the seventh hour (iv. 52); that this or that remark was made, not by the disciples generally, but by Philip (vi. 7, xiv. 8), or Andrew (vi. 9), or Thomas (xi. 16, xiv. 5), or Judas, not Iscariot (xiv. 22). The name of the servant whose ear Peter cut off is given (xviii. 10). In two different places the native town of Peter and Andrew is mentioned as Bethsaida (i. 44, xii. 21): the Synoptic Gospels would rather have led us to conjecture Capernaum.

There is one passage in particular which by its graphic character forcibly impresses me with the conviction that I read the testimony of an eyewitness: I mean the account (xx. 3) of the conduct of Peter and an unnamed disciple (who is unmistakeably the Evangelist himself), when Mary Magdalene came running to tell them that the body of our Lord had been removed from the sepulchre; how the younger was foremost in the race, but contented himself with looking into the sepulchre; how Peter, with characteristic boldness, went in, and how the other disciple then followed the example set him. If any but an eyewitness devised all these details, so minute and so natural, we must credit him with a literary skill such as we nowhere else find employed in the manufacture of Apocryphal Gospels. But there remains to be mentioned a touch so subtle, that I find it impossible to ascribe it to a forger's invention. Not a word is said as to the effect of what he had seen on the mind of Peter; but we are told that the other disciple 'went in, and saw, and believed: for as yet they had not known the Scripture, that Christ must rise again from the

dead.' Is it not plain that the writer is relating his own experience, and recalling how it was that the idea of the Resurrection opened on his mind as a reality? And lastly, note that we have here the work of no reckless forger. To such an one it would cost nothing to record that he and Peter had then seen our Lord. But no; the disciples are merely said to have returned to their own home. It is Mary Magdalene who remains behind and first enjoys the sight of the risen Saviour.

V. If it has been proved that the author of the fourth Gospel was an eyewitness, little time need be spent on the proof that he was the Apostle John; for few would care to dispute this, if forced to concede that the Evangelist actually witnessed what he related. To accept him as an eyewitness implies an admission that the things he tells are not mere inventions: and some of these things could only have been known to one of the inner circle of disciples who surrounded our Lord. The Evangelist tells what these disciples said to one another (iv. 33, xi. 16, xvi. 17, xx. 25, xxi. 3, 7); what they thought (ii. 11, 17, 23, iv. 27, xiii. 22, 29); what places they were accustomed to resort to (xi. 54, xviii. 2, xx. 19). The epilogue to the Gospel (xxi. 24) identifies its author with him whom it describes as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved;' and even if there had not been this explicit declaration, the way in which that disciple is introduced (xiii. 23, xix. 26, xx. 2, xxi. 7, 20, and probably xviii. 15) irresistibly conveys the impression that the Evangelist wished his readers to understand that he himself was that disciple. The disciple whom Jesus loved must surely have been one of those three (Peter, James, and John), who in the Synoptic Gospels are represented as honoured by our Lord's special intimacy; and in this Gospel that disciple is expressly distinguished from Peter (xiii. 24; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20), while we know that James was dead long before the fourth Gospel was written (Acts xii. 2).

There is, however, one writer whose claims to the composition of the Gospel must be carefully considered, namely, one of the most shadowy personages in ecclesiastical history, John the Elder. A whole school of critics speak of him with as

assured confidence as if he were a person concerning whose acts we had as much information as concerning those of Julius Cæsar; but in truth his very existence seems to have been first discovered by Eusebius, and it is still a disputed matter whether the discovery be a real one. I have already quoted (p. 91) the passage of Papias's preface, from which Eusebius drew his inference. In naming the 'elders,' whose traditions he had made it his business to collect, having mentioned Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas and James, John and Matthew, Papias adds immediately afterwards the names of Aristion and John the Elder. Eusebius inferred from the double mention of the name that two Johns are spoken of: the first, who is coupled with Matthew, being clearly the Evangelist; the second, who is described as the 'elder,' and whose name is placed after that of Aristion, being a different person. Eusebius had learned from Dionysius of Alexandria (see p. 232) to recognize the possibility that there might have been more Johns than one; yet it must be observed that Dionysius himself had failed to notice that Papias had given any countenance to his suggestion. Irenæus also (see p. 92) seems to be ignorant of this second John, who is equally unrecognized by the great majority of later ecclesiastical writers.

It would be important if we could exactly know what Papias meant by calling the second John 'the elder.' It can scarcely mean only that he held the office of presbyter in the Church; for then Papias would not have used the definite article as he does, not only here in the preface, but afterwards, when he cites a saying of this John with the formula, 'This also the elder said' (p. 92). But Papias had used the phrase 'the elders,' as we might use the phrase 'the fathers,' in speaking of the venerated heads of the Church in a former generation. And since he gives this title to John, and withholds it from Aristion, it does not appear that we can lay any stress on the remark of Eusebius, that he places Aristion's name first. Further, this very title 'elders' is given by Papias to Andrew, Peter, and the rest whom he first enumerates, and therefore he cannot be supposed, in giving this title the second time to John, to intend to place him in a different category from those

in his first list. The only fact, then, which remains for us to build on is, that Papias in his preface names John twice over; but whether this is a mere slovenliness of composition, or whether he really means to speak of two Johns, is a matter on which it seems to me rash to speak positively, on such scanty knowledge as we have of Papias's work. It may be assumed that none of the subsequent passages in that work where John is mentioned speaks decisively on the present question, else Eusebius would have quoted it.

But though we cannot accept the existence of the second John as a proved fact, we may at least receive it as an admissible hypothesis, and may examine whether it enables us to give a better account of the Johannine writings. Judging merely by the diction, we could easily believe that the author of the Apocalypse was different from the author of the other books; so that if we reject the notion of Eusebius, that John the Elder, not John the Apostle, was the author of the former, we must still inquire whether we can invert the relation: Did John the Apostle write the Apocalypse, and John the Elder the Gospel? But here we are inconveniently pressed by the results we have just obtained, namely, that he who wrote the Gospel must have been an eyewitness and a close companion of our Lord. If this were not the Apostle, there must have been in our Lord's company one of whom the Synoptic Evangelists have told us nothing, and he no ordinary disciple, but the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who at the Last Supper reclined on the bosom of our Lord. Further, the name of this disciple was John, and here we have the additional difficulty that (as remarked, p. 63) the fourth Gospel gives no intimation of the intercourse of our Lord with any John but the Baptist. We can easily acquiesce in the suggestion that the Evangelist thought it needless to name himself: but if there was in our Lord's company a second John holding one of the highest places among His disciples, is it possible that the Evangelist could pass over him also in silence?

It follows, then, irresistibly, that if the writer of the fourth Gospel was not John the Apostle, he at least wished to be taken for him, and desired that his readers should think of no one else. Let us see, then, how the hypothesis works,

that the Gospel was written by a disciple of John, who wished to sink his own personality, and to present the traditions he had gathered from his master's teaching, together with some modifications of his own, in such a form that they might be taken for the work of John himself. But this hypothesis will not bear to be burdened with the addition that the recording disciple was John the Elder; for his is a personality which refuses to be suppressed. If this were 'John the Elder,' whose traditions Papias set himself to collect, he must have been a notable person in the Church of Asia, and we can hardly help identifying him with the John who is said to have lived to the reign of Trajan, and to have been the teacher of Polycarp and other early Asiatic bishops.* At all events, we cannot help identifying him with the author of the Second and Third Epistles, who designates himself as 'the elder.' These Epistles are recognized by Irenæus and by Clement of Alexandria (see p. 211). Their brevity and the comparative unimportance of their matter caused them to be looked on with some suspicion. Origen tells of some who did not regard them as genuine† (Euseb. vi. 25); and they are not included in the Peshitto Syriac.‡ Jerome was disposed to ascribe them not to John the Apostle but John the Elder (*De Viris Illust.* 9). Other proofs may be given of re-

* Ecclesiastical tradition speaks so constantly only of one John in Asia, that Scholten, Keim, and others have rid themselves of the double John by denying that the Apostle John was ever in Asia; but the arguments they offer in support of their paradox are so weak that I have not thought it worth while to discuss them.

† Origen's immediate object apparently would lead him to present the least favourable view of disputed books. He is deprecating the multiplication of books, and with that object remarking how small is the number of books of Scripture. Compared with all the Churches 'from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum,' to which Paul fully preached the Gospel (Rom. xv. 19), how small is the number of Churches to which he wrote Epistles, and these but short ones! Peter has left only one undisputed Epistle: there may be a second, but that is controverted. John owns (xxi. 25) how many of the deeds of Christ he has of necessity left unrecorded; and (Rev. x. 4) that in his Apocalypse he had not been permitted to write all that he had heard. He has left also a very short Epistle. There may be likewise a second and a third, for the genuineness is not universally acknowledged; but in any case they do not make up 100 στίχοι in all. (Origen, *In Joann.* v., Præf. 1–4, pp. 94–96, *Philocal.* ch. 5).

‡ Ephraem Syrus quotes 3 John 4. (*De Tim. Dei* Opp. Gr. I. 76 F.)

luctance, on the part of those who recognized them, to set them on a level with the First Epistle.

I believe that these hesitations arose from the fact that these Epistles were not included in the public reading of the early Church—a thing intelligible enough from the private nature of their contents. The antiquity of the letters is undoubted, and they are evidently precious relics of a venerated teacher carefully preserved by the Asiatic Church; but to those who were ignorant of their history they appeared to stand on a different level from the documents sanctioned by the public use of the Church. If the external evidence leaves any room for doubt about the two minor letters, internal evidence removes it; for the hypothesis of forgery will not stand examination. A forger would surely inscribe his composition with some well-known name; he would never have referred the authorship to so enigmatical a personage as 'the elder.' But, above all, the contents of the Third Epistle exclude the supposition of forgery, for which indeed no conceivable motive is apparent. The writer represents (*v.* 11) that he had sent a letter to a Church, but that his messengers, instead of being received with the hospitality which was the invariable rule* of the Christian societies, were absolutely rejected. The man who claimed to take the leading part in the government of the Church not only failed to receive them himself, but, under pain of excommunication, forbade anyone else to do so. This is clearly a case not of inhospitality, but of breach of communion. The bearers of 'the elder's' letter are treated precisely as he himself had directed that heretical teachers should be treated. 'If there

* See Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Peter iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 10; Tit. i. 8; and compare Acts xvi. 15, xvii. 5, xxi. 8, 16, Rom. xvi. 23. We learn from the newly-discovered 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' that it was found necessary in the early Church to make regulations in order to prevent the readiness of Christians to entertain strangers from being traded on by idle persons, who tried to make the pretence of preaching the Gospel a means of living without working. 'Let every Apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord. But he shall only stay a single day, but if need be another day also. But if he stays three days he is a false prophet. Let the Apostle when he leaves you take nothing but bread enough to last till he reaches his quarters for the night. But if he asks for money he is a false prophet' (ch. xi.).

come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds' (2 John 10, 11). We may well believe (since we know the fact from the Epistle to the Corinthians) that schisms and dissensions existed even in Apostolic times; but this was a state of things a forger was not likely to invent or even to recognize. It is certain, then, that these two letters are no forgeries, but genuine relics of some great Church ruler, preserved after the circumstances which had drawn them forth were forgotten. And if ever the argument from identity of style and matter can be relied on, it is certain also that tradition has rightly handed down the belief that the writer was no other than the author of the First Epistle and the Gospel.

If this identity be established, it follows at once that that author is no unknown person who hides his personality under the cover of a great name. He comes forward in his own person, claiming great authority, sending his legates to an old established Church, and treating resistance to his claims on the part of the rulers of such Churches as idle prating (φλυαρεῖν), which he is confident that by his presence he will at once put down. And, according to all appearance, his anticipations prove correct, and his rule over the Churches of Asia is completely acquiesced in. When such a man publishes a Gospel containing a clearly implied claim on the part of the writer to be 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' I cannot suppose the claim to be made on behalf of someone else, but must regard it as exhibiting the grounds of the authority which the writer himself exercised. And no account of the matter seems satisfactory but the traditional one, that the writer was the Apostle John.

To the historical inquirer, then, the minor Epistles of St. John, being not impersonal like the First Epistle, have an importance quite out of proportion to their length. And though the light they cast on the writer's surroundings be but that of a lightning flash, enabling us to get a momentary sight of a position of which we have no knowledge as regards its antecedents or consequents, yet enough is revealed in that

short glimpse to assure us of the rank the writer occupied, and of the struggles which were at first necessary to establish his authority. Everything harmonizes with the traditional account that John came late in life to Asia Minor, where he must have found Churches of Paul's founding long established. There is nothing incredible in the statement that leading persons in such Churches at first resisted the authority, not of John himself, but of emissaries sent by him. The authority which these emissaries claimed may have seemed an intrusion on the legitimate rule possessed by the actual governors of the Church. It is remarkable that John appears to have found the form of government by a single man already in existence; for Diotrephes singly is spoken of as excommunicating those who disobeyed his prohibitions. Bishop Lightfoot is disposed (*Philippians*, pp. 202, 206, 7th ed.) to attribute a principal share in the establishment of episcopacy to the action of John in Asia Minor. But if the view here taken is right, John did not bring in that form of government, but found it there; whether it was that Paul had originally so constituted the Churches; or that, in the natural growth of things, the method of government by a single man, which in political matters was the rule of the Roman Empire, proved to be also the most congenial to the people in ecclesiastical matters. It is impossible for us to say whether the rejection of John's legates was actuated solely by jealousy of foreign intrusion, or whether there may not also have been doctrinal differences. Diotrephes may have been tainted by that Docetic heresy against which the Apostle so earnestly struggled (1 John iv. 3, 2 John 7).

Some have identified the hospitable Caius of the third Epistle with Paul's host at Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23);* but no argument can be built on the recurrence of so very common a name. This third Epistle professes to have had a companion letter: 'I wrote somewhat to the Church,' says the writer (*v.* 9); ἔγραψά τι, which seems to imply some short composition. I believe that we have that letter still in the

* Pseud. Athanas., *Synops. Sac. Script.*, ch. 76 (Athan. t. ii. p. 202, Ed. Bened.)

companion Epistle which has actually reached us. By those who understand the inscription as denoting an individual it has been variously translated: whether as in our version, 'to the elect Lady,' or 'to the elect Kyria,' or to the 'lady Electa.' I do not delay to discuss these renderings, because I believe that it is a Church, not an individual, which is described (*v.* 1) as known and loved by all who know the truth, of which it is told that some of her children walk in the truth (*v.* 4), to which the precept of mutual love is addressed (*v.* 5), and which possessed an elect sister in the city whence the letter was written (*v.* 13). We are not called on to explain why this mode of addressing a Church should have been adopted; but we can account for it if we accept Renan's conjecture (see p. 255) that Peter on his last visit to Rome had been accompanied by John, who, after Peter's martyrdom, escaped to Asia Minor. Certain it is that these two Apostles appear to have had very close relations with each other (Acts iii. 1, viii. 14, John xiii. 24, xviii. 15, xx. 2, xxi. 7); that the Evangelist shows himself acquainted with Peter's martyrdom (xxi. 19); while the Apocalypse exhibit marks of the impression made on the writer by the cruelties of the Neronian persecution. If, as I believe, Peter's Epistle was written from Rome, and if John was with Peter when he wrote it, it would be natural that the words of that letter should stamp themselves on his memory; and I have noted (see p. 236) some coincidences between Peter's Epistle and the Johannine writings. It would then be only a reproduction of the phrase ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή (1 Peter v. 13), if John applies the title ἐκλεκτή to the two sister Churches of Asia Minor; while again his description of himself as the elder would be suggested by ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος (1 Peter v. 1).

What I have said about the Second Epistle is in a great measure conjectural; but I wish you to observe that the uncertainty which attaches to all conjectures does not affect the inferences which I have drawn from the Third Epistle, and which I count as of great importance. At the present day Baur has more faithful disciples in Holland than in Germany. A typical representation of the form which Baur's theories take among his disciples of the present day is to be found in

a book called the 'Bible for Young People,' of which the New Testament part is written by a Dr. Hooykaas, and of which an English translation was published a few years ago. In this book the disciple whom Jesus loved is volatilized away.* We are taught that the last chapter of the fourth Gospel is intended only to give a symbolical revelation of certain passages of old Church history. If it is said that the disciple whom Jesus loved is to remain when Peter passes away, this only means that the authority of Peter, whose supremacy over the Apostolic communities is not disputed, was only to last during his life, whereas the disciple who read into the soul of Jesus will retain his influence till the perfecting of the kingdom of God. Who is meant by this disciple is not clear. The author is greatly tempted to think of Paul, but can find nothing to countenance this conjecture; so he has to be satisfied with setting him down as an ideal personage. In the presence of such attempts to turn the Gospel narrative into allegory, we have cause for gratitude that the short letter to Caius has been preserved to us. It matters little that we are ignorant of the circumstances that drew it forth, and that Diotrephes and Demetrius are to us little more than names. But we see clearly that the letter contains solid facts which cannot be allegorized, and that the writer is no abstraction, but a man busy with active work and engaged in real contests, one who claimed the superintendence of distant Churches, and who vigorously asserted his authority against those who refused obedience. I have looked for other solutions, but can acquiesce in none, save that he is the Apostle John.

* The notion that the disciple whom Jesus loved is not to be identified with the Apostle John, but is only an ideal personage, originated, as far as I know, with another Dutch divine, Scholten. See 'Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinasien' (Berlin, 1872), p. 110.

XVII.

Part VI.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTICS.

There is one class of objections to the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel which I might decline to discuss, as being outside the limits I have assigned myself in this course of lectures: I mean objections founded on real or apparent contradictions between the fourth and the Synoptic Gospels. For this is an argument which the objectors, on their own principles, have no right to urge. They do not believe that the writers of New Testament books were aided by any supernatural assistance, and therefore they have no right to demand from them more minute exactness of detail than other writers exhibit under similar circumstances. Now, we feel lively interest when a veteran statesman or soldier gives us his recollections of stirring events in which in his younger days he had taken part. But when such recollections are published, and compared with records made at an earlier date, it is the commonest experience in the world to find discrepancies, and these sometimes in particulars by no means unimportant. Yet we simply conclude that on these points the old man's memory may have played him false, and are not tempted to doubt the genuineness of the book which purports to be his memoirs. If, then, we have found reason to believe that the fourth Gospel contains an aged Apostle's recollections of the life of the Master whom he had loved, we should have no reason to give up that belief, even if we were unable to refute the allegation that these recollections are in some points at variance with earlier records. It would be possible to grant that the later account in some points needed correction, while yet we might believe the picture it presents of the life and work of our Lord to be, on the whole, one of the highest interest and value. But, though for the sole purpose of an inquiry as to the authorship of the fourth Gospel,

we might set aside as irrelevant a great deal of what has been said as to contradictions between this Gospel and its predecessors; yet so many of these alleged contradictions melt away on examination, that I think it well to give some little discussion to a subject important from other points of view.

A very important question to be settled in using the fourth Gospel is, What verdict are we to think the Evangelist means to pass on those things which are related in the Synoptic Gospels, but omitted in his? It is notorious that the things recorded in this Gospel are, for the most part, different from those related by the other Evangelists, so that it may be regarded as exceptional when St. John goes over ground which they have traversed. Among the things omitted by St. John are some of the most important events of our Lord's life. Thus, the institution of the rite of the Lord's Supper finds no place in his account of the night before the Passion, nor does he mention the Agony in the Garden. Now Renan, and a host of Rationalist critics with him, in using St. John's Gospel, go on the principle that he is to be understood as bearing testimony against whatever he does not relate; that we are to assume that he either had never heard of the things which he passes over in silence, or else means to imply that they never occurred. There is no better instance on which to test Renan's principle than that to which he confidently applies it in the opening sentence of his *Life of Jesus*, 'Jesus was born at Nazareth, a little town of Galilee.' When we inquire on what authority Renan has ventured on this correction of the traditional account of our Lord's birthplace, we find his main reliance is on the fact that John 'knows nothing' of the journey to Bethlehem; that 'for him Jesus is simply of Nazareth or of Galilee, on two occasions when it would have been of the highest importance to make mention of the birth at Bethlehem.'* Now, if you have not read your Bible with care it may surprise you to learn that it is quite true (as De Wette before Renan had pointed out) that not only does St. John's Gospel contain no assertion of the birth at Bethlehem or of the descent from David, but it reports more than one

* *Vie de Jésus*, p. 22.

uncontradicted assertion of the opposite. In the first chapter (*vv.* 45, 46) Philip tells Nathanael, 'We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph,' to which Nathanael answers, 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' an objection to which Philip makes no direct reply. Again, in the 7th chapter (*vv.* 41, 42) we are told of the difficulty which the birth of Jesus put in the way of His reception: 'Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?' No answer is given to these difficulties; nor, again, are we told that Nicodemus had any reply to make when his brother members of the Sanhedrim exclaimed, on his taking our Lord's part, 'Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet' (vii. 52). Thus St. John tells us expressly that there were current objections to the acknowledgment of our Lord's claims, which ran thus: 'Jesus is not of David's seed, as it was foretold the Messiah should be. Jesus was born at Nazareth, but the prophet foretold that the Messiah should be born at Bethlehem; therefore Jesus is not the Messiah of whom the prophets spoke.' And the Evangelist does not give the slightest hint how these difficulties are to be got over.

There are two ways of explaining his silence: one is that he did not know what answer to give to these objections; the other, that he knew his readers did not require any answer to be given. If it were not that the first is the explanation adopted by Renan, I should have thought it too absurd to need serious refutation. It is certain that the Evangelist believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and also that he believed in the Old Testament. How is it possible that he could take pleasure in bringing out the fact that the Jews held that there was a contradiction between acknowledging the Messiahship of Jesus, and acknowledging the truth of the Old Testament prophecies, unless he had in his own mind some way of reconciling this alleged contradiction? And since critics of all schools hold that John's Gospel was written at so late a date that the Synoptic accounts of our Lord's birth at Bethlehem,

of the seed of David, must then have been many years in circulation, and have had time to become the general belief of Christians, it is ridiculous to think that John had any way of answering the Jewish objection different from that which must have occurred to all his readers.

We can well believe that John would not have cared to repeat the objection if he knew no answer to it; but it is easy to understand why, knowing the answer, he did not trouble himself to state it formally. When we repeat the story of a blunder committed by ignorant persons, we do not think it necessary to demonstrate their error if we are addressing persons who understand the subject. For example, a very worthy man, some fifty years ago, declaiming against the necessity of human learning in an ambassador of Christ, exclaimed, 'Greek, indeed! I should like to know if St. Paul knew Greek.' In repeating such a story to educated persons, we leave it to speak for itself. We do not think it necessary to expand into formal argument the statement that St. Paul did know Greek, and that the fact that he wrote Epistles in that language is one of the reasons why it is desirable that persons should learn it whose duty it will be to expound these Epistles. Every disputant is pleased to find his opponent relying on an argument which he is sure he can in a moment demolish. And so every Christian reader of St. John's Gospel has read with a certain satisfaction and triumph how the Jews would have been willing to acknowledge the Messiahship of Jesus, only for this, that it was necessary the Messiah should be born at Bethlehem, and be of the seed of David. We are all ready with the answer, 'Why, so Jesus was.' And now we are asked to believe that the Evangelist did not sympathize with his readers in this matter; that he wrote in perplexity what they read in triumph. A critic who can so interpret the Gospel commands admiration for his ingenuity in contriving to go wrong on a point which scarcely any previous reader had been able to misunderstand.

I should not have cared to spend so many words on this matter, if it were not that the study of this example calls attention to some peculiarities of the Evangelist's style, and also throws some light on the question whether the fourth

Evangelist had seen the preceding Gospels. I ask you, then, in the first place, to observe that no writer is more in the habit than St. John of trusting to the previous knowledge of his readers: and it is not strange that he should; for at the late period when he wrote, he was not addressing men to whom Christianity was a novelty, but men to whom the facts of the history were already known. In the very first chapter (*v.* 40) he describes Andrew as Simon Peter's brother, taking for granted that Simon Peter* was known. A reference to the Baptist (iii. 24) is accompanied by the parenthetical remark, 'for John was not yet cast into prison,' evidently intended for men who knew that John's career had been thus cut short, but who needed the explanation that the events which the Evangelist is relating occurred while the Baptist was still in activity. He does not directly tell of the appointment of the twelve Apostles, but he assumes it as known (vi. 70), 'Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' His narrative does not inform us that Joseph was the reputed father of our Lord, but this appears incidentally when the Jews ask, 'Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?' (vi. 42: see also i. 45). The Baptism of our Lord is not expressly mentioned, but is implied in the account the Baptist gives of his having seen the Spirit descending on him (i. 32). The Ascension is not related, but it is thrice referred to (iii. 13, vi. 62, xx. 17). As a general rule this Evangelist prefers to leave unspoken what he can trust his readers to supply. He does not claim to be the unnamed disciple who heard the testimony of John the Baptist (i. 40), nor to be the unnamed disciple through whose interest Peter was admitted to the high-priest's palace (xviii. 16); yet there can be little doubt that in both cases the impression received by most readers is that which the writer intended to convey. I have already (p. 63) noted the most striking example of this writer's 'ignorance,' that he 'knows nothing' of the Apostle John; yet few dispute that if he were not that Apostle himself, he was one who desired to pass for him.

* It may be mentioned that John (i. 43) gives Peter the name Cephas, which is not found in the Synoptic Gospels, but is recognized by St. Paul (1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9).

This Evangelist repeatedly brings the knowledge which he assumes to be shared with him by his readers into contrast with the ignorance of the actors in the events he relates. Hobbes explained laughter as arising from a sudden conceit of our own superiority to someone else; and though it may be doubted whether this gives a sufficient account of all our mirthful emotions, it is certain that it is by exciting this conceit of superiority that literary artists have produced some of their most telling effects. Even a child is pleased when he can boast to his fellows that he knows something which they do not; and this is a kind of pleasure through which, when they can give it to their spectators, dramatic authors have found the surest way to win applause. No scenes are more effective than when the character on the stage is represented as ignorant of something known to the spectators, and in his ignorance using expressions which have a reference the speaker does not dream of. The staple of most comedies is that someone on the stage is deceived, or is under a misapprehension, while the spectators are in the secret; and their pleasure is all the greater the more convinced the deceived person is that he knows everything. Thus the duped father in Terence believes that he is the only wise man of the family—

> Primus sentio mala nostra; primus rescisco omnia,
> Primus porro obnuntio:

but the slave presently puts the feelings of the spectators into words—

> Rideo hunc; se primum ait scire, is solus nescit omnia.

The effect of tragedy is equally heightened when a personage is represented as ignorant of his real position. In the *Œdipus Rex** of Sophocles much of the tragic effect is derived from the king's unconsciousness that he is himself the object of

---

* Much of what is said here I have said elsewhere in a Paper contained in a volume of sermons now out of print, called 'The Irony of St. John;' the title of which, as well as its use of the word 'irony,' were borrowed from Bishop Thirlwall's celebrated Essay on 'The Irony of Sophocles' (*Philological Museum*, ii. 483).

the wrath of heaven; while, as the spectators hear him denounce the author of the city's calamities, they are thrilled by the knowledge that it is on himself he is imprecating vengeance.

Touches of the same kind are as effective in historical narrative as in the drama. Every reader remembers the effect of Isaac's question, when bearing the fuel for Abraham's sacrifice: 'My father, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?' In one touch the contrast is brought out between the boy's ignorance and the father's and the reader's knowledge that he is himself the destined victim. If the ending of the story were not happy, nothing could have a more tragic effect than this simple question. To the same principle is due the effectiveness of another Scripture story, Nathan's parable, by which David's indignation against tyrannical injustice is raised to the highest point before he knows that he is himself the culprit on whom he pronounces sentence.

Now passages of the character I have described occur to an unusual amount in St. John's Gospel. I believe that in that Gospel can be found as many cases as in all the rest of the New Testament where the characters are introduced as speaking under misapprehensions which the reader knows how to correct. Sometimes the Evangelist himself tells how their mistakes are to be corrected, as where the Jews say (ii. 20), 'Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt Thou rear it up in three days?' the Evangelist adds 'but He spake of the temple of His body.' But in the majority of cases no explanation is given. A few verses before one of the passages relied on by Renan, the Jews ask (vii. 35, 36), 'Whither will He go that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles and teach the Gentiles? What manner of saying is this that He said, Ye shall seek Me, and shall not find Me: and where I am, thither ye cannot come?' But no explanation is given of the true answer to this question. Nicodemus asks (iii. 4), 'How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?' Yet the meaning of the answer made him would be unintelligible to one not

already impregnated with Christian ideas. The woman of Samaria misunderstands our Lord's saying when she says (iv. 15), 'Sir, give me this water that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw;' yet the Evangelist passes on without remark. And so, in like manner, when the Jews ask, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (vi. 52). But the most striking examples of the introduction of characters speaking truths of which they have themselves no consciousness, are that of Caiaphas (xi. 50), declaring that it was 'expedient that one man should die for the people;' and that of Pilate (xix. 21), insisting, in spite of the chief priests' remonstrance, in inscribing on the title on the cross, not that our Lord *said* He was the King of the Jews, but that He was the King of the Jews.

I have given proof more than sufficient to show that no writer is more in the habit than St. John of trusting to his reader's previous knowledge, and that no one understands better the rhetorical effect of leaving an absurdity without formal refutation, when his readers can be trusted to perceive it for themselves. For the secret of an orator's success is if he can contrive that his hearers' minds shall not be passive, but shall be working with him, and even running before him to the conclusions which he wishes them to draw. It is to me amazing that Renan, who professes to value this Gospel so highly, should never have discovered this characteristic of its style, but should treat the book as if he had to do with an author like Euclid, who is careful to guard matter-of-fact readers from misapprehension by appending *quod est absurdum* to the conclusions which he does not wish them to believe. It would not have been worth while to make so much comment on Renan's want of literary tact in misunderstanding St. John's statements about our Lord's birthplace, if this had been an isolated piece of stupidity; but full discussion was necessary, because if Renan is wrong in this case it is because he proceeds by a faulty method, which misleads him equally whenever he has to deal with incidents omitted by St. John.

From the facts that have been stated I draw the further inference that, at the time when St. John wrote, he knew

that other Gospels had been written. The thing is in itself likely. We may gather from the last chapter that it, at least, was not written until after the death of Peter. It is true that this last chapter has been imagined to be the work of another hand, but I know no good reason for thinking so. It is not a good reason that the Gospel has seemed to come to an end in the preceding chapter; for there is nothing strange in an author's adding a postscript to his work, whether before publication or in a second edition.* There is no external evidence of any kind to induce us to separate the authorship of the last chapter from that of the rest, and there is complete identity of style. It is not only those who have been nicknamed 'apologists' who defend the genuineness of this chapter. Hilgenfeld, for instance (*Einleitung*, p. 719), notices the mention of the Sea of Tiberias, Thomas called Didymus, Nathanael of Cana of Galilee, and the disciple whom Jesus loved; and I would add that the reference in *v.* 20 to the preceding history is quite in St. John's manner (see vii. 50, xi. 2, xviii. 14, xix. 39). Hilgenfeld also points out the resemblance of the phrases ὡς ἀπὸ πηχῶν διακοσίων, *v.* 8, with ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε (xi. 18); of the bread and fish (ὀψάριον καὶ ἄρτον), *v.* 9, with the same words (vi. 11), the word ὀψάριον being, in the *N. T.*, peculiar to St. John; and the ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων, *v.* 24, with i. 34, xix. 35. And I think there is a wonderful trait of genuineness in the words (*v.* 22), 'If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?' The great age of the Apostle had seemed to justify the interpretation which some disciples had put on these words, viz. 'that that disciple should not die.' The Evangelist evidently accepts it as a possibility that this may be the true interpretation of them, but he contents himself with recording what the words of Jesus actually were, and pointing out that they do not necessarily bear this meaning. I do not believe that a forger of the next century could have given such a picture of the old age of the beloved disciple, looking and longing for the reappearance of his Master, thinking it possible that he might

* Quite similar phenomena present themselves in the conclusion of the Epistle to the Romans.

live to see it, yet correcting the belief of his too eager followers that he had any guaranteed promise that he should.

Now, if this 21st chapter be an integral part* of the Gospel, John must have written after the death of Peter; but at that late period other Gospels had been written, and John did not live so completely out of the Christian world as not to be likely to have seen them. But what to my mind proves decisively that he had is the fact that he can venture to state most formidable objections to the Messiahship of Jesus without giving a word of refutation. If Christians were then dependent on traditional rumour for the belief that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, that He was of the seed of David, that Joseph was not his real father, I cannot believe that John would have refrained from giving his attestation to the truth of these beliefs, or have left his readers without his assurance that the answer they might be expected to give to the Jewish objectors was the right one. The fact, then, that John felt

* It has been attempted to separate the last two verses from the rest, and to ascribe them to John's disciples. But with regard to 'We know that his testimony is true' (*v.* 24), Renan owns that very nearly the same words occur again in 3 John 12 (where, however, *οἶδας* seems the true reading); and he might have added that they have a close parallel in John xix. 35. *οἴδαμεν* is a favourite Johannine word, occurring five times in the six verses 1 John v. 15–20.

Renan states (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 535) that *v.* 25 is wanting in the Sinaitic MS.; but this is a slip of memory. What Renan had in his mind was that Tischendorf had expressed his opinion that this verse was in a different hand from the rest. He thought that the scribe, whom he calls A, who wrote the rest of the Gospel, had stopped at the end of *v.* 24, and that *v.* 25, with the subscription, was added by the corrector, whom he calls D, and who, he believes, was also one of the transcribers of this and of the Vatican MS. If this were so, it would be probable that *v.* 25 had been wanting in the archetype of the Sinaitic, and had been added by the corrector from a different source.

But Tregelles did not share Tischendorf's opinion as to there being a difference of handwriting; and Dr. Gwynn has noted that the same indications, whence Tischendorf infers (see p. 160) that the scribe D wrote the conclusion of St. Mark, prove that he did not write the conclusion of St. John. Contrary to the practice of that scribe, the name *Ἰωάννης* is written in the subscription here with two *ν*'s; and the final 'arabesque,' as Tischendorf calls it, or ornament drawn with a pen between the last line and the subscription, is exactly of the same pattern as that found in the other books written by the scribe A, and is quite different from the four written by the scribe D, viz. Tobit and Judith, St. Mark and 1 Thess. (the last leaf in each of these two *N. T.* books, having been cancelled and rewritten by D). There is, therefore, no ground to imagine that *v.* 25 is in any way discredited by the testimony of the Sinaitic MS.

himself called on to give no answer to the objection that Christ must, according to the prophets, be of the seed of David, and of the town of Bethlehem, appears to me to be a proof that he knew that his readers had in their hands at least one of the Gospels which contain the genealogy tracing our Lord's descent from David, and which relate the birth at Bethlehem.

I draw the same inference from the supplemental character of St. John's Gospel. As I think that mere accident will not account for the likeness to each other of the Synoptic Gospels, so also do I think that mere accident will not account for the unlikeness of St. John's to the others. If he had written an account of our Saviour's life without any knowledge that other accounts had been written, it is incredible that he could have so successfully avoided telling what is related in these other accounts. It is exceptional if we find in St. John anything that had been recorded by his predecessors; and when we do, there is usually some obvious reason for its insertion. Thus the miracle of feeding the five thousand is used by St. John to introduce a discourse peculiar to his Gospel. The true explanation, I am persuaded, is that which has commonly been given, viz. that this Evangelist, knowing what accounts Christians already had in their hands, wrote his Gospel with the intention of supplementing these previous accounts. When he omits what his predecessors had related, he is not to be supposed to discredit them, or to wish to contradict them; but it is part of his plan not to bear testimony to what had been sufficiently attested already.

That St. John's silence is neither the silence of ignorance nor of disparagement becomes still plainer when we examine each instance severally. Thus he does not relate the institution of the Eucharistic Feast; and Renan takes this omission as a proof that our Lord did not then institute the rite, a conclusion in which Strauss on other grounds agrees. And certainly for anyone who does not acknowledge our Lord's Divinity, it is an important thing to overthrow, if possible, the Synoptic account of this part of the history. For see what is involved in the acceptance of this account. That

Jesus should on this night have spoken of his approaching death Strauss believes to be possible enough. He thinks that he must have seen what feeble support followers, who understood him but imperfectly, were capable of giving against relentless foes. His idea is that when Jesus, as master of the household, broke the bread, and poured out the wine, for distribution among his disciples, the thought may have involuntarily presented itself to him that even so would his body soon be broken, even so his blood soon be poured forth, and that he may have expressed some such gloomy forebodings to his disciples. But if we grant, what Strauss admits to be possible, that Jesus, looking on his death as a sacrifice, may have regarded his blood as the consecration of a new covenant between God and mankind, and that in order to give a living centre to the community which he desired to found, he may have commanded the perpetual repetition of this distribution of bread and wine, we are led to views of our Saviour which can hardly fall short of those held by the Church. At the moment when our Lord sees that death can be no longer escaped, and that the career which he had planned has ended in failure, he calmly looks forward to the formation of a new society which shall own him as its founder. He foresees that the flock of timorous followers, whose dispersion on the next day he ventures to predict, will recover the shock of their disappointment and unite again. As for the shameful death, the thoughts of which oppress him, instead of anticipating that his followers will put it from their thoughts, and blush to remember their credulity when they accepted as their Saviour one unable to save himself, he commands his disciples to keep that death in perpetual memory. Notwithstanding the apparent failure of his course, he conceives himself to be a unique person in the world's history; and, in Strauss's words, he regards his death as the seal of a new covenant between God and mankind. Further, he makes it an ordinance of perpetual obligation to his followers that they shall seek the most intimate union with his body and blood, and holds out to them this closeness of perpetual union with himself as the source of all spiritual life. He intimates that the rite then being enacted was

comparable with the first setting apart of the Jewish nation to be God's peculiar people; and as Moses had then sprinkled the people with blood, saying, 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you' (Ex. xxiv. 8), so now he calls his own the blood of the new covenant. This legislation for a future Church was made at a moment when his most attached disciples could not be trusted to remain with him for an hour, and when he had himself predicted their desertion and denial. Surely, in the establishment of the Christian Church, with its perpetual Eucharistic celebrations, we have the fulfilment of a prophecy, such as no human forecast could have dreamed of at the time the prophecy was uttered.

The case I have been considering must be added to the proofs given above (p. 217) that the Synoptic Gospels represent our Lord as using, concerning His own claims, no less lofty language than does St. John's. For what mere man has dared to set such a value on his own life as to speak of it as a sacrifice for the sins of the world, the source of all good to mankind? If with respect to the institution of the Eucharist St. John is to be regarded as contradicting the account of the Synoptics, we must inquire which account is the more credible; and then we have to consider that the Synoptic account is not only the earlier, but is confirmed by the perpetual practice of the Church. The very first time we read of Christian communities after the day of Pentecost we are told of their 'breaking of bread' (Acts ii. 42, 46); and if we want more information about the rite, we obtain it from a document earlier than either the Synoptic Gospels or the Acts, namely, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, in which, having spoken of 'eating the Lord's Supper' (xi. 20), he goes on to give an account of the institution of the rite, in strict agreement with that in St. Luke's Gospel. How great value Christians, from the earliest times, attached to the eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, appears from words which I cite without scruple, since the progress of criticism has tended to dispel the doubts once entertained about the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles, 'I wish for the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which

is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and as drink I desire His blood, which is love incorruptible' (Ignat. *Ep. ad Rom.* 7).

But now comes the most singular part of the discussion. So far is it from being the case that such language must be regarded as at variance with a Gospel which tells nothing of the institution of the Eucharist, that these words of Ignatius, or, if you will, of pseudo-Ignatius, have been generally accepted as evidence that the writer was acquainted with St. John's Gospel. When St. John wrote, Eucharistic celebrations were prevailing widely, if not universally, over the Christian world; and many years before, St. Paul had told how our Lord had commended the rite with the words, 'This is My body,' 'this is My blood.' Renan would have us believe that St. John intended by his silence to negative that account, yet no writer has done so much to strengthen the belief which we are told he desired to oppose. In fact one of the arguments which sceptical writers have used to induce us to assign a late date to the fourth Gospel is the resemblance of the language of the sixth chapter to the Eucharistic language of the writers of the second century. They say that in the Synoptic Gospels the Eucharist is but a memorial, or that at most there is a reference to some atoning efficacy attached to the Passion of Christ. In Justin Martyr, on the other hand, the Eucharist is a means by which spiritual nourishment is mystically conveyed to the soul. He speaks of these elements as no longer common bread and wine, and he teaches that as the Divine Logos became flesh and blood for our salvation, so our flesh and blood, by partaking of this heavenly nourishment, enter into communion with a higher spiritual nature (*Apol.* i. 66). This is evidently the same doctrine as that taught (John vi. 55), 'My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me and I in him.' And in Lecture VI. I have taken pains to show that Justin derived his doctrine from St. John.

I own I do not think it possible satisfactorily to explain John vi. if we exclude all reference to the Eucharist. If both the Evangelist knew and his readers knew that our Lord had

on another occasion said, 'Take, eat, this is My body; drink this, this is My blood,' they could hardly help being reminded of these expressions by that discourse about eating His flesh and drinking His blood. On this point St. John's Gospel throws light on the Synoptic account. It softens the apparent harshness and abruptness of these words at the Last Supper, when we learn that this language about eating His flesh and drinking His blood was not then used by our Lord for the first time. We are told that in a discourse delivered at the Passover season of the preceding year (John vi. 4), our Lord had prepared the minds of His disciples to receive the idea of communion with Him by eating His flesh and drinking His blood. His language, then, at the Last Supper, instead of causing perplexity to the disciples, would remind them of the discourse spoken at the preceding Passover season, and would remove the perplexity caused by His previous dark sayings. The words, 'Take, eat, this is My body,' would then mean to them, Hereby can you do that which perplexed you when I spoke of it before.

In any case there can be no doubt of the fact that the discourse recorded in John vi. has had the effect of greatly increasing the value attached by Christians to the Eucharistic rite, and it cannot plausibly be maintained that this effect was one which the narrator neither foresaw nor intended; that he was ignorant of this ordinance or wished to disparage it. And if the result of the previous investigation has been to establish that this Evangelist habitually relies on the previous knowledge of his readers, we cannot doubt that in this as in other cases he speaks words *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν*; and that he gives no formal account of the institution of the Eucharist, only because he knew that his readers had other accounts of it in their hands.

Very nearly the same things may be said about St. John's omission of our Lord's command to His disciples to go and baptize all nations. If by his silence he intended to disparage the rite of baptism, it is a strange accident that it is words of his which caused Christians to entertain an even exaggerated sense of the absolute necessity of that rite, and which suggested the name *ἀναγέννησις*, by which in the middle

of the second century baptism was generally known (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 61, with an express reference to our Lord's words to Nicodemus).

And so likewise as to the Ascension. Although John does not formally relate it, he not only refers to it in two texts already quoted, 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?' (vi. 62); 'Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father' (xx. 17); but he assumes the fact, not in a single verse, but throughout the Gospel. The Evangelist is never weary of teaching that Jesus is a heavenly person, not an earthly; His true home heaven, not earth. The doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ is made to smooth away all difficulties in admitting the fact of the Ascension. 'No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.' If, then, St. John, who so frequently declares that Jesus had been in heaven before He came to earth, does not bear formal testimony to the fact that Jesus returned to heaven after He left earth, it can only be that he was aware that this was already well known to his readers by the attestation of others.*

I think it needless to multiply proofs that St. John did not write for men to whom the story of our Lord's life was unknown; but that, on the contrary, he constantly assumes his readers' knowledge of the leading facts. Instead of taking it as our rule of interpretation that he contradicts whatever he does not report, we should be much nearer the truth if we held that he confirms what he does not contradict. And the more we study this Gospel, the more weight, we find, deserves to be attached to the Evangelist's even indirect indications of opinion. The Synoptic Gospels may fairly be described as artless narratives of such deeds and words of Jesus as had most fastened themselves on His disciples' recollection; but the fourth Gospel is avowedly written with a purpose, namely, 'that ye might believe that Jesus is the

* Renan remarks (iv. 408) that the story of our Lord's ascension was known to the writer of the Apocalypse; for that on this story is based the account of the resurrection, followed by an ascension, of the two witnesses, xi. 12.

Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His name' (xx. 31). The Gospel bears the marks of having being written after controversy concerning our Lord's Person had arisen. The writer seems like one who has encountered objections, and who therefore anticipates difficulties by explanations. For example, he meets the difficulty, If Jesus walked on the sea because there was no boat in which he could follow His disciples, how was it that the multitude was able subsequently to follow Him? (vi. 23). He meets the more formidable difficulty, How could Jesus be divine if He was deceived in His judgment of one whom He had chosen to be an Apostle? (ii. 24, vi. 71, xiii. 11.) All this gives the more weight to those passages in the Gospel which assert or imply the doctrine of the Godhead of our Lord. We know that we are not wresting chance expressions to a use different from that which the writer intended; but that these utterances are the deliberate expression of the Evangelist's firm conviction.

If we find reason to think that St. John knew of previous Gospels, it is difficult to believe that these were other than those we have now, which all own were written before his. There are several coincidences between St. John's Gospel and the Synoptics, but perhaps hardly sufficient of themselves to prove his obligation to them. He refers (iv. 44) to words of our Lord which he had not himself recorded, 'For Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country' (see Matt. xiii. 57). In the story of the miracle of feeding the five thousand, which is common to all four Gospels, there are coincidences which, however, may be explained as arising from independent familiarity with the facts. The mountain unto which our Lord ascended to pray is, as in the other Gospels, '*the* mountain' τὸ ὄρος. In Matthew and Mark a distinction is carefully made between the two miracles of feeding the multitude, the baskets taken up being in the former case κόφινοι, in the latter σπυρίδες—a distinction, by the way, scarcely to be accounted for if we assume that the common element of those Gospels was only Aramaic. St. John agrees with the earlier Gospels in the

use of the word *κόφινοι*. St. John preserves a feature that distinguishes Mark from Matthew, the 200 pennyworth of bread which the disciples exclaim would be needed to supply the people. Some minute critics have accused John of love of exaggeration because he says (vi. 7) that Mark's 200 pennyworth (vi. 37) would not be enough. It is odd that there is another coincidence between John and Mark in which the difference is the other way. The ointment with which our Lord was anointed might, according to John (xii. 5) have been sold for 300 pence; according to Mark (xiv. 5) for more than 300 pence. The most striking coincidence between these two Evangelists is in the words by which this ointment is described, *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς*, the last a word which puzzled even Greek commentators. If the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel be genuine, there is a further coincidence in the relation of the appearance to Mary Magdalene. John agrees with Luke in naming one of the Apostles 'Judas, not Iscariot,' who is otherwise named in Matthew and Mark. We could not build much on the mere fact that Mary and Martha are named by both; still less on the name Lazarus, which in Luke occurs in a different connexion; but the description (xii. 2) of Martha as 'serving,' and the part ascribed to the two sisters in *ch.* xi. are in close harmony with St. Luke's account. Again, both Evangelists speak of Satan entering into Judas (Luke xxii. 3, John xiii. 27); and of the Holy Spirit as sent by Jesus (Luke xxiv. 49, John xvi. 7). There appears to be a reference to an incident more fully recorded by John, in Luke xxiv. 12, but there is uncertainty as to the reading.

An interesting question is, Where could John have read the story of our Lord's Ascension? If I have been right in contending that John would not have omitted to state formally where our Lord had been born unless he knew that this had been done already, it seems also that he would not have omitted to tell of the Ascension unless he had known it to have been previously related. But if this be so, we have only the choice of three suppositions, and the acceptance of any of them leads to interesting consequences. Either — (1) John read Mark xvi. 19, and then it would

follow that words, which have been questioned because they were not in some of the copies seen by Eusebius, were in the copies used by St. John; or (2) he read the words ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν in Luke xxiv. 51, and this is also opposed to the decision of modern critics; or (3) John was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles, and read the account of the Ascension in the first chapter.

I have spoken of the things omitted by John and told by the Synoptics. I had intended to speak of the things told by John and omitted by the Synoptics; but I have not left myself time to speak of more than one. I refer to the fact, of which notice has often been taken, that the Synoptics relate no visit of our Lord to Jerusalem during His public ministry save that which ended in His death; while the scene of almost all the discourses recorded by John is laid at Jerusalem, and he relates visits of our Lord on the occasion of more Jewish feasts than one. In fact it is by the help of St. John's Gospel, and by the feasts there mentioned, that the duration of our Lord's ministry is calculated. If we had none but the Synoptic Gospels we might acquiesce in the notion taken up by some of the early fathers from the phrase, 'the acceptable year of the Lord,' that His ministry lasted but one year.

It used to be one of the stock objections to St. John that he is here opposed to the more credible account given by the Synoptics. But the tide has now turned, and Renan has pronounced that on this question there is a signal triumph for the fourth Gospel. In the first place, it would be extremely improbable that our Lord should have failed to do what every devout Jew made a point of doing—attend the Jerusalem feasts. We know that our Lord's parents complied with this ordinance, and brought Himself up to Jerusalem, when He was only twelve years of age. We know that our Lord's Apostles scrupulously attended the feasts. After the Passover at which He suffered, they still came up to the following Pentecost. Even St. Paul, who was not considered sufficiently national, made it a point to attend the feasts; and we are told how on one occasion he resisted the pressing entreaties of Gentile converts to make a longer stay

with them, because he was anxious to attend a feast at Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 20: see also xx. 16). What, then, can we suppose to have been the conduct of Jesus Himself, who more than once declared that He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it? Further, if our Lord made His appearance in Jerusalem for the first time at His last Passover, it seems incredible that the Jerusalem priests and rulers should have conceived so sudden a jealousy of their visitor, should instantly come to the conclusion that His existence was incompatible with the safety of the nation, should at once concert measures for His destruction, should immediately succeed in finding one of His followers accessible to bribery, and carry all their schemes into execution within a space less than a week. All becomes plain and intelligible, if we accept John's account that Jesus and the Jewish rulers had been on more than one previous occasion in collision, so that he was well known to these rulers, who had resolved on His death before His last visit to the city. St. John likewise gives a reason why on this last visit a crisis was brought about. According to him, it was the miracle of the raising of Lazarus which on the one hand made the Jews feel that it was necessary to take some decisive step in contravention of the claims of Jesus; and on the other hand roused the hopes of His adherents to such a pitch that they went out to meet Him, and led Him in triumphal procession into the city. Matthew harmonizes with this account, although He does not state distinctly, as John does, that the procession which escorted Jesus was made up of Galilean Jews who had come up to the feast. For Matthew (xxi. 10, 11) represents the multitude as crying, This is Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth, of Galilee; while the inhabitants of Jerusalem are moved, saying, Who is this? There seems to be no ground for the common illustration of popular fickleness in the change of the cries from 'Hosanna' to 'Crucify Him.' It would seem to be multitudes of Galileans who cried 'Hosanna;' of the native citizens who shouted 'Crucify Him.'

But to proceed with my argument, that the first visit of our Lord and His Apostles to Jerusalem was not that Passover at which He suffered. What is decisive is the fact, that when

we turn to the Acts of the Apostles we find the headquarters of the disciples and the centre of the Apostolic mission at once established in Jerusalem: which would be highly improbable if they had arrived there for the first time only a few days before the Crucifixion. Thus, if there was a real contradiction between St. John and the Synoptic Gospels (and contradiction there is none, for his account is plainly only supplementary to theirs; but if contradiction there were) we must, on all grounds of historic probability, accept John's account as the true one. But when we examine the Synoptic Gospels a little more closely, we find several traces of a Judæan ministry. I will not lay stress on the last verse of the 4th of Luke, though, according to the chief modern critics, we ought to read, 'preached in the Synagogues of Judæa,' not Galilee. This is the reading of Codd. ℵ, B, and C, three of the most ancient extant MSS. But I may remark, in the first place, that, according to the Synoptic Gospels, Judas the traitor was (as the name by which he is commonly known indicates) a native of Kerioth in Judæa (Josh. xv. 25); that Joseph of Arimathea, 'a city of the Jews' (Luke xxiii. 51), or Ramathaim, was a disciple; that the account of the borrowing of the ass at Bethphage implies that our Lord was already known there; as does also the demand of the room at Jerusalem in which to eat the Passover. The supper given at Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, was clearly given by friends, not by strangers. But most decisive of all are these words, recorded both by St. Matthew and St. Luke: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *how often* would I have gathered thy children together,' which plainly implies previous warnings and visitations. The result is, that on this point, on which a former school of rationalist critics had pronounced John's Gospel not historically trustworthy, because opposed to the Synoptics, he turns out not to be opposed to them, and to state nothing but what, on grounds of historic probability, we must pronounce to be true. We have here, then, as Renan has said, a signal triumph for the fourth Gospel.

XVIII.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

I COME now to speak of the book of the Acts of the Apostles.* It is, as I said (p. 34), a very vital matter with unbelievers to bring this book down to a late date. For if it must be conceded that this work was written by a companion of St. Paul, it will follow that the still earlier book, the Gospel, which confessedly † has the same authorship, must have been written by one in immediate contact with eye-witnesses, and must be regarded as thoroughly historical.

I need not spend much time in discussing the external evidence. At the end of the second century, the earliest time of which we have copious Christian remains, the evidence of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, shows the authority of the Acts as well established as that of the Gospels.‡ The Muratorian Fragment treats of this book next after the Gospels.§ There is an undisputed reference to the Acts in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177 (Euseb. v. 1); and since it has been proved (see p. 206)

* This is the title of the book in Clement of Alexandria, in Tertullian, in the Muratorian Fragment, and in Cod. B. The title 'Acts' in the Sinaitic MS., a title used also by Origen, must be regarded only as an abridgment. The full title is given in the subscription in the Sinaitic.

† This is 'a fact which no critic ventures to impugn' (Davidson, ii. 146). 'On ne s'arrêtera pas à prouver cette proposition, laquelle n'a jamais été sérieusement contestée (Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. x.).

‡ Iren. iii. 14, 15; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 12, *Hypotyp.* i. *in* 1 *Pet.* (p. 1007, Potter's edition): see Euseb. vi. 14; Tert. *adv. Marcion*, v. 1, 2, *De Jejun.* x.

§ See p. 49. Notwithstanding the corruption of the passage which speaks of the Acts, the general drift is plain, viz. that the writer means to say, however erroneously, that it was Luke's plan only to relate things at which he had himself been present; and that we are thus to account for the silence of the Acts as to Peter's martyrdom, and as to Paul's journey to Spain.

that Marcion, in the early part of the century, found the third Gospel holding an established rank, we cannot doubt that the Acts had obtained currency at the same period. There are several coincidences with the Acts in other second-century writers; but about these I do not care to wrangle with critics who regard evidence that comes short of demonstration as no evidence at all. When, for example, Clement of Rome (*ch.* 2) praises the Corinthians for being 'fonder of giving than receiving,'* we cannot prove that he had in his mind our Lord's saying (Acts xx. 35), 'It is more blessed to give than to receive;' and when Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* 3), tells how our Lord, after the Resurrection, ate and drank with the disciples (*συνέφαγεν καὶ συνέπιεν*), we cannot demonstrate that he knew the *συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν* of Acts x. 41, or that in calling heretical teachers 'wolves' (*ad Philad.* 2), he was thinking of Acts xx. 29. Let us allow that Hermas may have been ignorant of Acts iv. 12, when he says, that there is none other through whom we can be saved than through the great and glorious name (*Vis.* iv. 2); and that it may be pure accident that Polycarp chanced upon words so like those of Acts ii. 24, when he says (*ad Philipp.* i.), 'Whom God raised up, having loosed the pains of Hades.' Eusebius tells (iv. 29) that Dionysius of Corinth relates that Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted to the faith by Paul the Apostle, according to the account given in the Acts, was the first bishop of Athens; and as we have not got the letters of Dionysius, we cannot confute anyone who may be pleased to say that the reference to the Acts was only made by Eusebius, and that it was through some other source Dionysius found that there had been an Areopagite of his own name. In like manner, let us admit the possibility that Papias, who mentions Justus, surnamed Barsabas,† may have derived his knowledge of him from some

* *ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες.* Lightfoot gives a proof of Clement's knowledge of the Acts more difficult to evade, namely, that (ch. 18), in quoting Psalm lxxxix. 20, he introduces three distinct phrases, not found in the Psalm itself, but only in Paul's quotation of it, Acts xiii. 22.

† *Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν. Παπίας ὁ εἰρημένος ἱστόρησεν ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου ὅτι Βαρσαβᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰοῦστος δοκιμαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ἰὸν ἐχίδνης πιὼν ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθὴς διεφυλάχθη. ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ τὴν*

source different from the Acts; and I frankly own that anyone may refuse to accept the opinion, which I hold myself, that Papias, who used St. Matthew's Gospel, would have adopted the account which that Gospel gives of the death of Judas Iscariot, if he did not read a different story in some document

---

μητέρα Μαναΐμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν· περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων ὅτι ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων. This note has been lately printed by De Boor, in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Band V, Heft 2, p. 170), from an anonymous note found by him in Codex Barocc ianus, 142. The substance of what is here stated about Justus Barsabas had been given by Eusebius (iii. 39); but there are here two or three additional details, which have all the appearance of being derived from independent knowledge of Papias. The note is conjectured to have been extracted from the Ecclesiastical History of Philip of Side, published about A. D. 427. The statement that some of those raised by Christ lived to the *reign of Hadrian* (A. D. 117–137) would be important as fixing a limit in one direction to the date of Papias, if we could be sure that this statement really comes from Papias. But it is almost certain that there has been confusion; for Eusebius, from whom almost everything else in these extracts is derived, gives this statement (iv. 3) on the authority, not of Papias, but of Quadratus; and he could hardly have failed to mention Papias if he had known that a like statement had been made by him. Still more doubt attaches to the statement that John had been killed by the Jews. This account of the death of John is quite inconsistent with all other known traditions on the subject; and it may be pronounced incredible that it could have been really given by Papias. For it is inconceivable that such a statement, by so ancient a writer, should not have the slightest influence on Church tradition; that neither Eusebius nor anyone else should have taken notice of it; that it should be first heard of in the fifth century, and then the knowledge of it almost lost till our own generation. The ascription of this statement to Papias had hitherto rested on the authority of Georgius Hamartolus (circ. A. D. 842); or, to speak more cautiously, on the authority of a single transcriber of his *Chronicle* (Coislinianus, 305); this note, not found in any other manuscript of the *Chronicle*, having been brought to light by Nolte (*Tübingen Quartalschrift*, 1862, p. 466). The passage has been discussed by Lightfoot (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 211), who sufficiently shows the violent improbability that Papias could have made the statement attributed to him. De Boor now considers that the discovery of the fragment printed above has placed it beyond all doubt that Papias really handed down that John was slain by the Jews. But, in truth, the only thing placed beyond doubt is, that Georgius, or his transcriber, did not invent the statement, but copied it from an older author. But the reasons for rejecting the ascription to Papias remain in full force, even if that ascription has the authority of Philip of Side. Lightfoot has given a probable account of the origin of the blunder, by whomsoever made. It is likely enough that Papias—whose work we have some reason to think consisted of notes on the Gospels—in commenting on Matt. xx. 23, noted, as fulfilling our Lord's words, the facts that John had suffered banishment to Patmos, and James been slain by the Jews: see Origen's Commentary on the same passage (*in Matth.*, tom. xvi. 6), where this explanation is given how both sons of Zebedee could be said to have drunk of our Lord's cup. The statement then that we are discussing, which attributes to both James and John what

to which he attributed equal authority.* It is true that, if we accept the traditional account of the authorship of the Acts, the coincidences I have mentioned, and several others, are at once accounted for; but if anyone chooses to say that they are all accidental, though I think his assertion very improbable, I do not care to dispute the matter with him.

In fact, it is much more important for a critic, who opposes the received authorship of the Acts, to impugn these early quotations than it is for us to maintain them. If Clement of Rome, before the end of the first century, read the book, there can be no reasonable ground for doubt that the work is as early as the Church has always held it to be; but if Clement makes no quotation from it, no inference can be drawn from his silence about a book to which his subject in no way called on him to refer. But, in point of fact, our reception of the Acts scarcely at all depends on these proofs of the early use of the book. It is an important point, no doubt, to establish that the book we have now was received without hesitation by the Christian Church as far back as we can trace its history; yet if this work were a new 'find,' recently disinterred from some Eastern library, we still might be confident that we have here some genuine remains of the Apostolic age. In fact, the internal evidence of the latter chapters of the Acts proves irresistibly that these contain matter which must have proceeded from an eye-witness. In saying this, I say no more than our adversaries acknowledge. Davidson says (ii. 136) of the so-called 'we' sections of the Acts, that is to say, the sections in which the writer uses the first person plural, that they are 'characterized by a circumstantiality of detail, a vividness of description, an exact knowledge of localities, an acquaintance with the phrases and habits of seamen, which betray one who was personally present.'

Papias, as I believe, only said of James, may have assumed its form either through the dropping out of a line by a transcriber, or through the inaccuracy of a *memoriter* citation.

* Apollinarius of Laodicea, through whom we obtain our knowledge of this matter, reconciles the accounts in Matthew and in the Acts by stating, as on Papias's authority, that Judas did not die when he hanged himself, but that his body afterwards so swelled, that in passing through a place wide enough for a cart to go through, he was so crushed that all his bowels were emptied out (Routh, *Rell. Sac.*, i. 9).

If you know nothing of the history of the controversy, you will perhaps imagine that such a concession as I have quoted, and which is no more than is readily made by all critics of the same school, amounts to a recognition of the antiquity of the book of the Acts. But this is not the only case where theorists of the sceptical school will make a forced concession, and hope to save the main part of their hypothesis from destruction. These hypotheses are like some living beings of low organization, which it is hard to kill, because when you lay hold of one of them, the creature will leave half its body in your hands, and walk off without suffering any apparent inconvenience. When we encounter a theory impugning the authority of one of our New Testament books, if we point out passages in the book containing marks of genuineness which cannot plausibly be contested, then so much of the theory will be abandoned as disputes the genuineness of these particular passages; but it is still hoped to maintain the spuriousness of the rest.* If it is pointed out that the passages acknowledged as genuine are indissolubly connected with some of those alleged to be spurious, the theory will then be modified again, just so far as is necessary to meet this new difficulty. In the present case the marks of genuineness in the 'we' sections are too strong to be denied. It is therefore found unavoidable to own that this part of the book of the Acts is a real relic of the Apostolic age; but the Tübingen theory is that some compiler who lived in the second century happened to get possession of memoranda really made by a travelling companion of St. Paul, whose name we don't know, and that the compiler incorporated these in a narrative, in the main unauthentic, and intended to disguise the early history of the Christian Church. Thus, Hooykaas (see p. 295) says (v. 33), 'As to the later fortunes of St. Paul, the writer of Acts had access to some very good authorities, the best of all being the itinerary or journal of travels composed by one of the Apostle's companions. Portions of this work he took up

* In particular, this is the history of the criticism of the 2nd Epistle to Timothy.

almost unaltered into his own. In this itinerary, then, we possess the records of an eye-witness. This is of incalculable value.'

The 'almost unaltered' of this extract are words that all critics of the same school would not adopt. The evidence of identity of language and style is so strong as to convince even prejudiced critics that the 'we' sections, as they stand now, bear marks of the same hand as that to which we owe the rest of the book; while also these sections contain relations of miracles which the same critics are unwilling to believe were told by a contemporary. So the theory which simply separated the authorship of the 'we' sections from that of the rest is owned to be inadequate; and it is now usually presented with the addition that the second-century compiler, when incorporating these sections in his book, revised and retouched them, and made to them some additions of his own.

Who was the original writer of the memoranda, rationalist critics are not agreed. The claims of Timothy have been strongly urged, notwithstanding that, to name no other objection, Timothy is expressly distinguished from the writer who uses the first person plural (*ch.* xx. 4, 5). Silas has had his advocates, but the favourite seems to be Titus; and, accordingly, Hooykaas always refers to the author of the memoranda as Titus (?) Why St. Luke, with or without a note of interrogation, might not have been left in possession of the authorship of the memoranda, even if he were deprived of that of the rest of the book, is not, at first sight, easy to explain: for even with critics of this school it ought not to be thought a disadvantage to an hypothesis that it should have some amount of historical attestation. Paul's Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11) show that he had a companion of the name of Luke. If it were conceded that he was the author of the 'we' sections, at least in their original form, it would seem to explain why the whole book should be attributed to him.

But here is a circumstance of which it is well worth while to take notice. The name of Luke is not found in connexion with the Acts in any extant uncial MS.; and we cannot but

think that the ascription would have been preserved, had it been found in earlier MSS. On the other hand, the name of Luke is invariably inscribed to the third Gospel. We cannot, then, reasonably suppose the history of the ascription to be that the name of Luke was originally attached only to the latter part of the Acts; that it then passed to the whole book; and being accepted, on the faith of their MSS., by Christians of the second century, was afterwards extended to the Gospel which they perceived to be of the same authorship. The true history seems to be just the reverse. It would appear to be from the Gospel that the name of Luke passed to the Acts; and then a verification of that ascription is afforded by the fact that we find from the Epistles that Paul had a companion named Luke. In any case, I cannot account for the reluctance of rationalist critics to own Luke as the author of what they regard as the original portions of the Acts, except through a feeling on their part that the name of Luke is indissolubly connected with the third Gospel.

It is time that I should formally remind you what those 'we' sections of which I have been speaking are. They begin Acts xvi. 9. Luke appears to have joined Paul at Troas, and to have accompanied him to Philippi. There he seems to have been left behind; for when Paul leaves Philippi the use of the pronoun 'we' ceases, and is not resumed until Paul returns to Philippi, some six or seven years after. Then (*ch.* xx. 5) the 'we' begins again, and continues till the arrival in Jerusalem (xxi. 18). It begins again in chap. 27 with Paul's voyage, and continues till his arrival in Rome, xxviii. 16. I may add that in Codex D, which in the Acts is full of untrustworthy additions to the text, the tradition that Luke was of Antioch is attested by a 'we' in Acts xi. 28, the prophecy of Agabus being described as having taken place 'when *we* were gathered together.' I only mention this reading, but not as having any title to your acceptance. Some have excluded from the 'we' sections the part containing Paul's address at Miletus; but unreasonably. For, though in the latter part of the 20th chapter the narrator has had no occasion to speak in the first person, he claims in the first verse of the next chapter to have been one of the party who

had to tear themselves away from the sorrowing embraces of their Ephesian friends.

I may mention here that some thoughtless objectors* have taken for a note of spuriousness in this narrative what is really a proof of genuineness. Paul, it is said, is represented (xx. 17) as in such a hurry to get to Jerusalem that he will not visit Ephesus, yet afterwards he spends a week at Tyre (xxi. 4), and 'many days' at Cæsarea (*v.* 10). But it is quite natural that Paul should calculate his time differently before crossing the sea and afterwards. Even in times much later than St. Paul's, travellers in those seas have not been able to count on expedition. The author of *Eothen* says that when he read the *Odyssey* he had thought ten years rather a long time for the hero to spend on his voyage home from Troy, but that since he had had personal experience of navigation in these parts, he had come to the opinion that Ulysses had a fair average passage. It appears (xx. 16) that Paul at the beginning of his voyage was by no means sure of being able to reach Jerusalem at the time he wished. Actually, he only succeeded in obtaining a passage in a ship which went no further than Patara. He could not foresee what delay he might encounter there; but after he had caught a ship for Tyre, and made a prosperous voyage thither, he could calculate his time differently; and, notwithstanding his week's delay at Tyre, might feel that he had several days at his disposal at Cæsarea before he needed to begin his land journey to Jerusalem. There are other frivolous objections, all proceeding on the assumption that Paul owned a yacht, or chartered a ship of his own, whereas I suppose the probability is, that he had to accommodate himself to the movements of the ships in which he found passage. Thus, why did not Paul go himself to Ephesus instead of sending a messenger to fetch his friends from that city? I daresay because he did not choose to run the risk that the ship might sail without him if he went away from Miletus. Why did not Paul send his message from Trogyllium, which was nearer, rather than from Miletus? I suppose because he knew that the ship would not make a

* See Hooykaas, vi. 332.

sufficiently long delay at Trogyllium, and that it would at Miletus. At the same time it may be remarked that MSS. are not unanimous as to the ship having touched at Trogyllium at all. But, in short, I think the best rationalist critics show their wisdom in abandoning all direct assaults on the 'we' sections as futile, and in restricting their efforts to the separation of these from the rest of the book.

But in this they have great difficulties. I pass over the initial difficulty, which to me seems sufficiently formidable :— How are we to account for the fact that an unknown person in the second century got exclusive possession of some of the most precious relics of the Apostolic age—relics the authenticity of which is proved by internal evidence, and yet of which no one but this compiler seems ever to have heard, while the compiler himself vanished out of knowledge ? The rationalist critics would scarcely make their story more miraculous if they presented their legend in the form, that the 'we' sections were brought to Rome by an angel from heaven, who immediately after disappeared. But new difficulties arise when they try to tear the 'we' sections away from the rest of the Acts ; for this book is not one of those low organizations which do not resent being pulled asunder. It is on the contrary a highly organized structure, showing evident marks that the whole proceeded from a single author. Thus references, direct or implied, are repeatedly made from one part of the book to another. The speech of Paul in the latter part of the book (xxii. 20) refers with some verbal coincidences to the part he took in the martyrdom of Stephen (vii. 58, viii. 1). In the 'we' section (xxi. 8) where Philip is mentioned, he is described as 'one of the seven' (Acts vi. 5), while his presence at Cæsarea has been accounted for (viii. 40). Peter in his speech (xv. 8) refers to former words of his recorded (x. 47). Words are put into our Lord's mouth (i. 5) similar to words which in the Gospels are only attributed to John the Baptist, and these words are quoted as our Lord's (xi. 16).*

* Other cross references are to be found on comparing xi. 19, viii. 1 ; xi. 25, ix. 30 ; xv. 38, xiii. 13 ; xvi. 4, xv. 28 ; xviii. 5, xvii. 14 ; xxi. 29, xx. 4 ; xxiv. 18, xxi. 26 ; xxvi. 32, xxv. 11.

I will notice one coincidence more between the earlier chapters and the later, which I think not only proves unity of authorship, but also that the author lived near the events—I mean the part which both divisions of the Acts ascribe to the Sadducees in the persecution of the infant Church. In the Gospels the chief opponents of our Lord are the Scribes and Pharisees. A Christian writer of the second century would hardly have known or cared much about the internal divisions among the Jews, and would naturally have followed the Gospels in giving greater prominence to Pharisaic hostility to the Gospel. But St. Luke makes us understand that, after the death of our Lord, His disciples obtained among the Pharisees toleration or friendship, which was refused them by the Sadducees. The Resurrection was the main subject of the Christian preaching, and this at once put the Christians on the side of the Pharisees in their chief subject of dispute with the Sadducees; while again the Pharisees found no difficulty in believing the Gospel accounts of angelic messages, which the Sadducees rejected as incredible. Further, the charge of having shed innocent blood most painfully affected the Sadducees, who at the time held the chief place in the government of the nation (Acts v. 17, 28). These considerations make Luke's account highly credible, that the Jerusalem Church counted among its members a large proportion of Pharisees (xv. 5, xxi. 20). St. Paul in one of his Epistles (Phil. iii. 5) confirms the account of the Acts that he had himself been a Pharisee; and if Luke were a companion of Paul's we can understand how he should have imbibed the feelings which led him to give such prominence to the hostility of the Sadducees to Christian teaching (iv. 1, v. 17). In this representation the book is consistent all through: the 'Scribes that were of the Pharisees' part' (xxiii. 9) interfere to protect Paul from the violence of the Sadducees, much in the same way as the chief Pharisaic Rabbi, Gamaliel, is represented at the beginning of the book (v. 30), as interfering on behalf of the elder Apostles.

An independent proof of the unity of authorship is obtained from a study of the language. Tables have been made of words, phrases, and turns of expression characterizing the

Gospel; and these are found reappearing in the Acts, and in all parts equally, in the latter chapters as much as in the earlier. It is not easy to lay before you details of the proof of the homogeneousness of the diction of the book, because no inference could be fairly drawn from only a few examples of recurring phrases, and it would be tedious to produce a great many; but it is not necessary, since the point is acknowledged, and is accounted for, as I have said, by the theory that the later compiler revised and retouched the sections which he borrowed. 'From these linguistic and other phenomena,' says Davidson (II. 145), 'it is clear that the writer of the book was not a mere compiler but an author. If he used materials, he did not put them together so loosely as to leave their language and style in the state he got them, but wrought up the component parts into a work having its own characteristics.' And yet we are asked to suppose that, with all this revision, the compiler did his work so clumsily as to leave in that tell-tale 'we,' the sections, too, where the 'we' occurs being separated from each other in the most inartificial manner. Here comes in the consideration that the compiler of the Gospel and the Acts was evidently a person of considerable literary skill. The less you believe (I will not say in the inspiration of the writer, but) in his substantial truthfulness, the more you must admire his literary skill. Where he and the other Synoptic Evangelists differ in their language in relating the same story, the difference is often accounted for by the supposition that the third Evangelist gave the language of his predecessors a literary revision. Take the letter of Claudius Lysias in the Acts. If we are not to believe that this was the real letter the chief captain sent, what dramatic skill it required to have invented it, making the chief captain, by a gentle distortion of the facts, give them the colouring which sets his own conduct in the most favourable light. There is the same dramatic propriety in the exordium of Tertullus, the hearing before Agrippa, the proceedings before Gallio; or, to go back still earlier, in the story of Peter knocking at the door, and Rhoda so delighted that she runs off with the news without waiting to open to him. A critic must be destitute of the most elementary qualifications for

his art who does not perceive that the writer of the Acts is no uneducated clumsy patcher together of documents, but a literary artist who thoroughly understands how to tell a story. And yet we are asked to believe that this skilled artist, having got possession of memoranda of one of Paul's companions, shovels them into his book pell-mell, without even taking the trouble to hide the discontinuity of his work by turning the first person into the third. If we suppose Luke to have been the author, there is no want of literary skill, but only great modesty in the quiet way in which he distinguishes these parts of the history of which he claims to have been an eye-witness.*

What, then, are the motives why such violence should be used to separate the 'we' sections from the rest of the book? There are two principal reasons. One of these is that which I explained in the first lecture. It is thought impossible that a book, so pervaded by miracles as the Acts, could be the work of one who was a contemporary with the events which he relates. There are those now who seem to have got beyond the doctrine that a miracle is impossible; they seem to hold it impossible that anyone should ever have believed in a miracle. Whether the former doctrine be good philosophy or not I am not going to discuss; but I am very sure that the latter doctrine leads to bad criticism.

The history of the criticism on this very book shows how very unsafe it is to take this principle as a guide. By denying the contemporary authorship of all but the 'we' sections,

* Renan agrees in the conclusions here expressed. With regard to the supposition that the compiler merely retained the first person plural which he found in an earlier document, he says (*Les Apôtres*. xi.): 'Cette explication est bien peu admissible. On comprendrait tout au plus une telle négligence dans une compilation grossière. Mais le troisième Évangile et les *Actes* forment un ouvrage très-bien rédigé, composé avec réflexion, et même avec art, écrit d'une même main, et d'après un plan suivi. Les deux livres réunis font un ensemble absolument du même style, présentant les mêmes locutions favorites et la même façon de citer l'Écriture. Une faute de rédaction aussi choquante que celle dont il s'agit serait inexplicable. On est donc invinciblement porté à conclure que celui qui a écrit la fin de l'ouvrage en a écrit le commencement, et que le narrateur du tout est celui qui dit "nous" aux passages précités.'

it is, no doubt, possible to remove from the book much of the supernatural; but much is left behind. The author of these memoranda also has several miracles to tell of. I may remind you of all the occurrences at Philippi, the testimony borne to Paul and Silas by the possessed damsel, and her cure by them, the earthquake in the prison, and the opening of the prison doors.* If the story of the shipwreck is, beyond any other part, full of touches showing that we have the report of an eye-witness, this part, too, contains the supernatural facts of a vision seen by Paul, and of his predictions as to the issue of the voyage, which are accurately fulfilled. And when Paul and his companions get safe to shore at Melita, we are told the story of the viper, and of miraculous cures effected by Paul on the island. So the remedy has been applied, of cutting out from the 'we' sections all the supernatural portions, and treating these as additions made by the later compiler.†

It can be shown that the parts which it is proposed to cut out are indissolubly connected with those which are left behind; but I do not enter into the proof, because I hold that criticism so arbitrary does not deserve an elaborate refutation. And in truth it seems to me that the human intellect cannot be less profitably employed than in constructing a life of Paul, such as might have been written by a Christian of the first century who conceived miracle to be an impossibility.

---

* 'The circumstances relating to the imprisonment of Paul and Silas at Philippi are sufficient to disprove the authorship of an eye-witness' (Davidson, ii. 149).

† This has been done, amongst others, by Overbeck in his Preface to his edition of De Wette's Handbook on the Acts. Overbeck has at least decisively proved that the 'we' sections, as they stand now, are so full of the characteristics of the author of the rest of the book, that the hypothesis that those sections were borrowed from another is not tenable, unless we assert that the borrower interpolated them with much of his own, and that in these interpolations he dishonestly used the pronoun 'we.' Overbeck's Preface has been translated, and included in the publications of the Theological Translation Fund. In the same volume is contained a translation of the chief work of the Tübingen school on the Acts, that by Zeller.

Zeller, a pupil and fellow-labourer of Baur's, was born in 1814, and was Professor of Theology at Berne in 1847; afterwards Professor of Philosophy at Heidelberg, and at Berlin, 1872.

Franz Overbeck, born at St. Petersburg, 1837, Professor of Theology at Basle, 1870.

A critic might as well spend his time in making a new edition of the play of Hamlet or Macbeth, cutting out as non-Shaksperian every passage which implied a belief in the supernatural.

But in addition to the predominance of the miraculous in the Acts, every disciple of Baur has a reason for rejecting the book, in its irreconcilable opposition to the Tübingen theory of the mutual hostility of Paul and the original Apostles. Here we have what professes to be a history of Paul by one of his friends; and the writer is absolutely no Paulinist in the Tübingen sense of the word. He represents Paul as on friendly terms with Peter and James, and these Apostles as anxious to remove any cause of offence or suspicion between the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Church of Jerusalem, while Paul himself is represented as most ready to meet their wishes in this respect. Paul is represented as observing Jewish ordinances, and as going up, on several occasions, to the Jewish feasts at Jerusalem; while in his speeches, as reported by St. Luke, there is little or nothing said about the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law. Peter's speeches in the Acts so thoroughly agree in doctrine with Paul, that they might have been written by Paul or by one of his disciples. Finally, Peter is made to anticipate Paul in the work of preaching to the Gentiles, while Paul himself is represented as only led into that work by the force of circumstances. When he and Barnabas start on their first missionary tour, the method with which they commence is to preach the Gospel only in the synagogues of the Jews (Acts xiii. 5). But in such synagogues there was always present a certain number of Gentiles, who had revolted at the absurdities and immoralities of heathen religions, and who heard with interest, or who had even formally embraced, the monotheism and pure morality of Jewish teachers. Among these Gentile members of the congregations Paul is represented as finding his most willing hearers. And at Antioch in Pisidia, when the Christian teachers encounter such violent opposition from the Jewish part of the audience, that they can no longer continue their preaching in the synagogue, they gladly avail themselves of

the friendly reception which the Gentiles are willing to give them, and continue their labours among them (Acts xiii. 46). But the system of beginning by preaching to the Jews is kept up in other cities.

We are told by Baur's disciples that the history of Paul, as told by Luke, which I have just summarized, is a complete falsification of the true history. This true history is that Paul, even before his conversion, had seen clearly that to become an adherent of Jesus of Nazareth, who had been condemned by the Law, and been loaded with its curse, was to renounce allegiance to the Law. It involved the acceptance of a new way of salvation, in which Jews had no higher claim than Gentiles, and it thus abandoned all national privileges. In a word, the preaching of the Crucified drew with it the overthrow of the whole Jewish religion. Viewing the matter thus, Paul persecuted Christianity as a pestilent heresy. But when he came to be shaken in his conviction that the cross had refuted the claims of Jesus, and when he had accepted the Resurrection as a fact, he did not cease to see, what had been evident to him before, that the acceptance of a crucified Saviour involved a complete breach with the Law. So he strove to find how this new revelation was to be reconciled with God's old one. He knew that he could get no light from the Twelve, who did not see what he had discerned before his conversion. So he retired to Arabia, thought out the whole matter for himself, and the result was that he broke entirely with his old past, and the Jew in him had died for ever. He went to Damascus, and there at once began to preach to the heathen. When obliged to flee thence, he preached to the heathen elsewhere, making Antioch his head-quarters. As to his beginning by preaching to Jews, we are not to believe a word of it. The communities of Judea probably knew little of the substance of his preaching; otherwise they would have had little reason to be satisfied with it, for Paul neither observed the Mosaic Law himself, nor permitted his converts, whether of Jewish birth or not, to do so. We are not to believe the author of the Acts, who would have us think (xxi. 24, 25) that a difference was made as to the conduct of Jewish and of Gentile Christians in such matters.

Now, on comparing these two accounts, we cannot help observing that it is the enemies of the supernatural who give a miraculous account of that wonderful fact—the transformation of Judaism which was an exclusive and national religion, into Christianity, which was a catholic and all-embracing one; while St. Luke gives a perfectly natural one. According to the Tübingen account, Paul not only passes with startling suddenness from the persecution of the new religion to the adoption of it, but he adopts it in such a way as to incur the opposition and hatred not only of the old friends whom he was forsaking, but of all the previous professors of the new faith which he was joining. We are to look on Paul as choosing a position of absolute isolation. We are taught to believe that everything implying friendly relations between Paul and earlier Christians is mere invention of St. Luke. There is no truth, it is said, in the statement that Barnabas had introduced Paul to the Jerusalem Churches (Acts ix. 27); that Barnabas had been commissioned by the Jerusalem Church to preach at Antioch; that it was in consequence of his invitation that Paul came there (xi. 22, 25); and that their earlier preaching had been confined to Hellenists. Paul had from the first struck out this new line of preaching to heathen. He had broken completely with his past, given up his Jewish observances, and was, in consequence, as soon as his practices became known, hated as cordially by Jews who owned Jesus to be the Messiah as by those who rejected Him. And yet the new type of Christianity introduced by this eccentric convert completely supplanted the old one. As soon as the new religion comes under the cognizance of the historical student, we find the Christian communities in every town constituting parts of one great corporation, and all these communities of the type invented by Paul. If we search for survivals of the original type of Christianity, we can find nothing making pretensions to be so regarded, except, in one little corner, a few Elkesaite heretics.

All this is truly marvellous, while the account of the canonical writer is simple and natural. Luke knows what modern theorists are apt to forget, that this champion of the

Gentiles was himself, by feeling and training, a Jew of the strictest sort, and he does not pretend that the traces of such training were suddenly obliterated. Paul's own Epistles show him to be thoroughly a Jew, loving his nation with such affection as even to be able to wish himself anathema from Christ for their sake. The same Epistles confirm Luke's account, that he who resisted the making Jewish observances obligatory on Gentiles had no such fanatical hatred of them as to refuse to practise them himself. 'To the Jews,' he says, 'I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law' (1 Cor. ix. 20).

And here let me say in passing that I cannot agree with some orthodox interpreters who regard the part which Paul took by James's advice in the Nazarite's vow on his last visit to Jerusalem, as deceitful on his part, and as in its result a failure. St. Luke's representation all through is, that though Paul resisted the imposition of the Mosaic Law on Gentiles, he did not forbid the practice of its observance by Jews; and it was as a practical proof of this that he exhibited himself in the Temple, taking part in a Jewish sacrifice. Nor do I see reason to regard this step as unsuccessful: it was done for the satisfaction of the Jewish Christians, of whom we are told there were many thousands, and there is no reason to suppose it had not the desired effect. It was unbelieving Jews from Asia who set on Paul, and raised the cry that he had introduced uncircumcised persons into the Temple.

I return to Luke's history of the admission of Gentiles into the Church. This is, that they ordinarily first became hearers of the word, through their having previously so inclined to Judaism as to frequent the Synagogue worship; and then that when Gentile converts came to be made in large numbers, the question, Must these men be circumcised before they can be baptized? came up as a practical one, and was decided by Paul in the negative. Now all this history is so simple and natural, that I venture to say that if this were Baur's account, and Baur's had been Luke's, Rationalist critics would raise a loud outcry against the reception of a story so contrary to

historic probability. That Paul's relations with the heads of the Jerusalem Church were friendly, whatever might have been the coolness towards him of inferior members, is attested by the Epistle to the Galatians, which tells that Peter was the object of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion; that he saw James on the same occasion; and that these Apostles with John afterwards formally gave him the right hand of fellowship, and divided with him the field of labour. The same Epistle also confirms Luke's account that Barnabas had been a party to the admission of Gentiles on equal terms to the Church: for when afterwards, under the pressure of a deputation from Jerusalem, there was a temporary abandonment of this principle, Paul notes with surprise, as the climax of the defection, that even Barnabas should have been carried away.

It is true that there is only one passage in Paul's speeches in the Acts where the doctrine of justification by faith without the deeds of the law is prominently dwelt on. I mean Acts xiii. 39: 'By him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.' And perhaps we may add xxvi. 18. But then it must be remembered that Paul is a character in real life, and not a character in a play. In a play it is a common device to put into the mouth of a character some pet phrase which he is always repeating, and by which the audience learn to recognize him. If the author of the Acts had not been a real companion of Paul, but a literary man who made Paul the hero of his story, our modern objectors show us how the work would probably have been done. The Apostle's Epistles show how earnestly he contended for the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law; and so phrases insisting on this doctrine would have been tagged on to all his speeches. But in real life a man whose career is not very short has many battles to fight, and the controversies in which at one time he takes an earnest part often die out before his life-work is finished. These controversies with Judaizing Christians form the chief topics of four Epistles all written at the same period of Paul's life, namely, to the Romans, to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians.

But these topics are nearly as absent from the other Epistles* as they are from the speeches in the Acts. In these last, where he is addressing audiences of unbelievers, his subject naturally is the Messiahship of Jesus, and the truth of His Resurrection. On the whole, I conclude that we are not justified in tearing so homogeneous a book as the Acts in pieces on either of the grounds alleged: that is to say, neither because the book tells of miracles, nor because it gives an untrue representation of the life and work of Paul.

On another ground the book has been alleged to betray that it is not a real history, but a story made up to serve a purpose. It is said that the compiler, whose object was to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church, put his materials together, with the view of drawing a parallel between Peter and Paul, and asserting their equality. If Peter is miraculously released by an angel from prison, when his life was threatened by Herod, Paul must be miraculously released at Philippi. If Peter strikes Ananias and Sapphira dead, Paul works a similar miracle on Elymas the sorcerer. And again, Paul's contest with Elymas is said to have been intended as a parallel to Peter's contest with Simon Magus.† Peter has worship offered him by Cornelius: the people of Lystra are on the point of sacrificing to Paul, and the people of Melita call him a god. If sick persons are healed because the shadow of Peter fell on them, from the body of Paul there are brought to the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and they recover. And, as I have already said, Paul's great work of preaching to the Gentiles has not only its counterpart, but its anticipation, in Peter's conversion of Cornelius.

That a certain parallelism exists in the history of the Acts between Peter and Paul need not be denied. The only question is whether this was a parallelism existing in fact, or one invented by the narrator. In all true history we have numerous parallelisms. I barely allude to Plutarch's attempt to

* Phil. iii. 9 is nearly the only instance of their introduction.

† 'Paul's encounter with Elymas the sorcerer in Paphos is similar to Peter's with Simon Magus. The punishment inflicted upon him resembles Paul's own blindness at the time of conversion; and thus the occurrence is fictitious' (Davidson, ii. 128). This 'thus' is beautiful.

find in the life of each Roman worthy a parallel to the history of some Grecian great man. On the principles of criticism by which the Acts have been judged, the history of France for the first half of this century and the last years of the century preceding, ought to be rejected as but an attempt to make a parallel to the history of England one hundred and fifty years before. Both stories tell of a revolution, of the beheading of a king, of the foundation of a republic, succeeded by a military despotism, and ending with the restoration of the exiled family. In both cases the restored family misgoverns, and the king is again dethroned; but this time a republic is not founded, neither is the king put to death; but he retires into exile, and is replaced by a kinsman who succeeds, on different terms, to the vacated throne.

The attempt to account for the book of the Acts as written for the sake of making a parallelism between Peter and Paul, and to find a purpose for every narration included in the book, completely breaks down. It would only be a waste of time if I were to tell you of the far-fetched explanations that have been given as to the purpose why certain stories were introduced; and I shall presently offer what seems to be a much simpler explanation of the choice of topics. But what I think proves decisively that the making a parallel between Peter and Paul was not an idea present to the author's mind, is the absence of the natural climax of such a parallel—the story of the martyrdom of both the Apostles. Very early tradition makes both Peter and Paul close their lives by martyrdom at Rome—the place where Rationalist critics generally believe the Acts to have been written. The stories told in tolerably ancient times in that Church which venerated with equal honour the memory of either Apostle, represented both as joined in harmonious resistance to the impostures of Simon Magus. And though I believe these stories to be more modern than the latest period to which anyone has ventured to assign the Acts, yet what an opportunity did that part of the story, which is certainly ancient —that both Apostles came to Rome and died there for the faith (Clem. Rom. 5)—offer to anyone desirous of blotting out the memory of all differences between the preaching of

Peter and Paul, and of setting both on equal pedestals of honour? Just as the names of Ridley and Latimer have been united in the memory of the Church of England, and no count has been taken of their previous doctrinal differences, in the recollection of their joint testimony for their common faith, so have the names of Peter and Paul been constantly bound together by the fact that the martyrdoms of both have been commemorated on the same day. And if the object of the author of the Acts had been what has been supposed, it is scarcely credible that he could have missed so obvious an opportunity of bringing his book to its most worthy conclusion, by telling how the two servants of Christ—all previous differences, if there had been any, reconciled and forgotten—joined in witnessing a good confession before the tyrant emperor, and encouraged each other to steadfastness in endurance to the end.

The absence of this natural termination to the book of the Acts, while it is absolutely fatal to the theory on which I have been commenting, is indeed hard to explain on any theory which assigns a late date to the book. Every reader feels some disappointment at the story being prematurely broken off; and as I have already mentioned, this was one of the things which the author of the Muratorian Fragment tried to account for. We hear of Paul being brought to Rome, to plead his cause before the Emperor. It is unsatisfactory merely to be given to understand that for two years he got no hearing. We ask, What happened after that? Was the Apostle then condemned, or was he set at liberty? and if so, did he carry out his once expressed intention of preaching the Gospel in Spain, or did he return to visit the Churches which he had previously planted? And are we to believe the story that he came a second time before the Roman tribunal, and closed his life by martyrdom? The connexion of St. Peter, too, with the Roman Church, is a subject on which we should wish to have some authentic information.

To my mind the simplest explanation why St. Luke has told us no more is, that he knew no more; and that he knew no more, because at the time nothing more had happened—

in other words, that the book of the Acts was written a little more than two years after Paul's arrival in Rome. To this two principal objections are made—(1) that the earlier book, the Gospel, must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem, which it distinctly predicts; and (2) that the Acts itself contains (xx. 25) a prediction that Paul should not return to Ephesus: a prediction which, it is supposed, the writer would not have inserted unless he had known that Paul's life had ended without any return to Asia Minor. On the latter objection I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the Pastoral Epistles; and neither objection makes the same impression on me as on those who believe prophecy to be impossible. I am aware, however, that some very good and orthodox critics assign the book a later date, and consider that the account of the Gospel message preached by Paul at the capital of the civilized world is a sufficient close and climax to the history. But unless we suppose that St. Luke projected a third work, which he did not live to execute, I find it hard to explain his silence as to the deeply interesting period of Church history which followed Paul's arrival at Rome, in any other way than by assigning a very early date to the book.

I have already said that the explanations completely break down which try to find some purpose in St. Luke's selection of topics in the Acts; and I need not tell you, for example, what far-fetched reasons have been given for the introduction of the Acts of the deacons, the account of the martyrdom of Stephen, the history of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, and soforth. The Muratorian Fragment explains Luke's principle of selection to be, that he tells of the things he had witnessed himself; and I believe that if you add to this, 'or of which he had the opportunity of hearing from eyewitnesses,' you will have the true explanation. So Luke tells in the preface to his Gospel how he made it his business to trace everything from the very first; and the Acts show what opportunities he had of gaining information. If, for instance, we read the 8th chapter of the Acts in connexion with the 21st, which tells of several days which Luke spent in Philip's house, we have decisive proof that the companion of Paul's travels was also the compiler of the early history. To account for the inser-

tion of the 8th chapter, I know no other way which is not forced in the extreme; while nothing can be more natural than that a visitor of Philip's, who was making it his business to gather authentic records of the Apostles' labours, should be glad to include in his collection a narrative so interesting, communicated to him by the very lips of a principal actor.

The account which the Acts give of this Philip may, I think, be regarded as proof of the antiquity of the book. For the name of Philip has an important place in early ecclesiastical tradition. There is quite satisfactory evidence that a Christian teacher of this name early settled in Hierapolis, that he came to be known in Asia Minor as Philip the Apostle, and that daughters of his were believed to have the gift of prophecy, and were regarded with high veneration. Papias (Euseb. iii. 39) speaks of these daughters, and represents some of the traditions which he records as resting on their authority. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 6, and see Euseb. iii. 30) says that Philip the Apostle had daughters whom he gave in marriage to husbands. Polycrates of Ephesus (Euseb. v. 24) states that Philip, one of the Twelve, had two daughters who remained virgins to old age, and who died at Hierapolis; and a third daughter who had walked in the Holy Spirit, and who rested at Ephesus. If we are to lay stress on Clement's plural number, and to infer that Philip had more married daughters than one, then, since he had two who did not marry, we must conclude that he had at least four daughters. In the dialogue between Caius and Proclus, written at the very beginning of the third century, the Montanist interlocutor Proclus speaks of four prophetesses, daughters of Philip, whose tomb was still at Hierapolis, and that of their father as well (Euseb. iii. 31). There can be little doubt that Proclus identified the Philip of Hierapolis with the Philip of the Acts, as Eusebius expressly does. Whether they were right in doing so is a question which cannot be confidently answered. The Philip of the Acts lived at Cæsarea, and is described as one of the Seven; the other Philip lived at Hierapolis, and was regarded as one of the Twelve. It is quite possible that two different Philips might each have four daughters; yet the simplest way of explaining the facts seems to be that the

Philip of the Acts, subsequently to Luke's visit, removed from Palestine to Asia Minor;* and certainly it seems more probable that the Hellenist Philip should so migrate than the Apostle, who presumably was a Hebrew. We can believe, then, that in process of time the veneration given Philip as a member of the Apostolic company caused him to be known as an Apostle—a name which in early times had various applications, as I shall afterwards have occasion to remark—and eventually to be popularly identified with his namesake of the Twelve. Of the four daughters who were unmarried at the time of Luke's visit, two may afterwards have married, and one of these may have died early, or otherwise passed out of sight.

If the Philip of Hierapolis was really not an Apostle, it is needless to say what a stamp of antiquity the knowledge of this fact puts upon Luke's book. But at present I am not concerned with the question whether Philip the deacon afterwards went to Hierapolis. I am merely pointing out that Luke's intercourse with him accounts for the insertion of some sections in the Acts. We are distinctly told of 'many days' of such intercourse, but it is likely that there was a great deal more. Paul was for two years a prisoner at Cæsarea; and as Luke had been his companion in his journey to Jerusalem, and was afterwards his companion in his journey to Rome, it is likely that they were much together in the intervening time, and therefore that Luke at Cæsarea would constantly see Philip. He would there hear from him of his mission to Samaria, and of the subsequent mission thither of Peter and John. He would also hear from him of the appointment of the Seven, of whom Philip had been one; and no doubt he would learn much from the same authority of the most distinguished member of the Seven, Stephen, and of his glorious martyrdom. At Cæsarea Luke may very possibly have met Cornelius; and in any case he would be sure to hear there of the remarkable step taken in his case by Peter.

* That this became the received opinion may be gathered from the fact that, in Jerome's time, they showed at Cæsarea the chambers of the four daughters, not the tombs (*Ep.* 108, *ad Eustochium*).

Among the sources used by Luke, I see no objection to include travelling memoranda made by himself; for though I quite disbelieve the myth of a journal of Paul's companion having fallen into the hands of an unknown person in the next century, such a journal might easily have been preserved and used by the writer; and the exact details we meet with in the account of Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, and his voyage to Rome, have quite the air of a narrative made from a diary. This supposition will at least serve to answer some frivolous objections made to the 'we' sections from their inequality of treatment. In one place it is said they give a mere list of names. We took Paul in at Assos, and came to Mitylene, and came the next day over against Chios, and the next day we touched at Samos, and the day after arrived at Miletus. Then there will be a pretty full account. Then the whole details of the shipwreck are given, but of the three months at Melita scarcely anything is told. But anyone who has kept travelling memoranda knows that this is exactly the kind of thing they are apt to be; where nothing interesting occurred, only a bare register of the places where the night was spent; then perhaps some record of greater length, and after the journey is for the time over, and the traveller settled down in a place, no entry made at all.* On the whole, I consider that a study of the choice of topics in the Acts leads to a conviction both of the unity of authorship, and also of the author's care to write only of things concerning which he had full means of information.

I come next to mention another consideration from which the antiquity of the book of the Acts may fairly be inferred.

* Objections made by Baur to the credibility of the story told in the last verses of the Acts have been repeated by his followers, but to me seem very unreasonable. The story is, that Paul, anxious to learn whether, on his trial before the emperor, his release will be opposed by the heads of the Jewish community at Rome, puts himself in communication with them. He finds that during the long interval that had elapsed since his arrest, the rulers at Jerusalem had let him drop out of sight. They had given no commission against him, either by letter or message, to their friends at Rome. But though these last had heard nothing against Paul personally, they had heard much against his religion. He begs to be allowed to speak in its defence, and gets a hearing accordingly. But the result is, that though he makes a favourable impression on a few, the greater part go away unconvinced. This story seems to me to bear the stamp of simple truth.

First let me premise that we may take it as acknowledged, that if the compiler of the Acts was not Paul's travelling companion, he was at least a Paulinist, well acquainted with his master's manner. The vocabulary of Paul's speeches in the Acts has been compared with that of Paul's Epistles, the result being to extort the confession from an unfriendly critic that the author of the Acts was undoubtedly familiar with the Pauline diction.* It has been attempted to extenuate the force of this concession by an attempted proof that the Pauline speeches in the Acts also contain many of Luke's favourite words. It is owned, however, that this cannot be said of all the Pauline speeches. Thus, with regard to Paul's speech at Athens, Davidson says, 'It must be confessed, however, that the discourse contains many peculiar expressions, there being no less than twenty-six words in 19–34 which do not occur in Luke;' and his conclusion about this speech is, 'We think that it is the speaker's to a considerable extent. It is in harmony with the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and if it be a condensed summary of many addresses, the sentiments and part of the language are probably Paul's'† (Davidson, ii. 109).

* The following is Davidson's abstract of the results of Lekebusch's study of Paul's speech to the Ephesian Elders at Miletus. I copy it chiefly for the sake of the concluding sentence, in order to show how such evidence is met by a hostile critic. The list of instances given might easily be amended by striking out two or three of no great force, and adding others. '*δουλεύειν τῷ* Κυρίῳ, Acts xx. 19, six times in Paul, only in Matt. vi. 24, Luke xvi. 13 besides; *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, xx. 19, five times in Paul, only in 1 Peter v. 5 besides; *ὑποστέλλω*, xx. 20, Gal. ii. 12; *τὸ συμφέρον*, xx. 20, three times in 1 Cor., only in Heb. xii. 20 besides; *διακονία*, xx. 24, twenty-two times in Paul; *μαρτύρομαι*, xx. 26, Gal. v. 3, Eph. iv. 17; *καθαρὸς ἐγώ*, xx. 26, Acts xviii. 6; *φείδομαι*, xx. 29, seven times in Paul, only in 2 Pet. ii. 4, 5 besides; *νουθετεῖν*, xx. 31, seven times in Paul; *ἐποικοδομεῖν*, xx. 32, six times in Paul, only in Jude 20 besides; *κοπιᾶν*, active, xx. 35, thirteen times in Paul; the hortative *γρηγορεῖτε*, xx. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 13. These may show nothing more than a writer familiar with the Pauline diction, as the author of the Acts undoubtedly was' (Davidson, ii. 112).

† It must be observed that this speech does not occur in one of the 'we' sections, so that if it be a genuine specimen of Paul's preaching, the hypothesis that the compiler of the Acts somehow got possession of a journal kept by Paul's travelling companion, has to be supplemented by a further hypothesis that he also got possession of other genuine records of Paul's preaching. This speech has a character corresponding to Paul's education. Tarsus was the central university town for Cilicia and Cyprus, and was so famous that even Romans esteemed it. This country was the

Now, with regard to the attempt to find traces of Luke's hand in the report of other speeches of Paul, let me remark that, admitting the attempt to be successful, the inference that follows is exactly the opposite of what is supposed. Let us concede that Luke had a monopoly of his favourite expressions, and that if we find one of them in a report of Paul's speeches, we are entitled to conclude that Paul never uttered that expression; still if the speech in the main contains Paul's sentiments, and Paul's language, we are bound to believe that the other person who has left traces of his hand must be the person who heard and reported the speech. We can easily believe that the hearer of a speech, when he afterwards came to write it down from memory, might, while giving the substance correctly, introduce a little of his own phraseology; but we may be sure that if a compiler of the next generation got possession of a genuine report of speeches of Paul he would incorporate them in his work *verbatim*. Thus, in my opinion, if it be once acknowledged that the report of Paul's speeches in the Acts exhibits familiarity with the Pauline diction, a real proof that these speeches, before being written down as we have them, had passed through the mind of the compiler of the Acts, would go to confirm the traditional opinion that this compiler had been a companion and hearer of St. Paul. I may add, in confirmation of this result, that Alford has remarked that the speech (Acts xxii.), which was spoken in Hebrew contains no Pauline expression, while it abounds in those peculiar to St. Luke; on the other hand, the speech (Acts xvii.), which Luke does not profess to have heard himself, contains none of Luke's characteristic phrases.

But now I come to the point at which I was desirous to arrive. If it is owned that the compiler of the Acts was a Paulinist, 'undoubtedly familiar with the Pauline diction,'

cradle of Stoicism. Amongst the Stoic teachers which it supplied were Zeno of Cyprus, Persæus of Cyprus, Chrysippus of Soli, and Aratus of Soli, who is quoted in the speech. Paul, therefore, had been brought up in a Stoic atmosphere; and in the speech he takes the Stoic side against the Epicureans, in their doctrine about Providence, about the unity of nature of all nations (*v.* 26), and about Pantheism, all that is true in which is recognized (*v.* 28).

we ask how he acquired that familiarity. If it was not from personal intercourse with the Apostle, it must have been from diligent study of his Epistles, and such study a Paulinist of the next generation could not fail to give. But the strange point is, that no satisfactory proof can be made out that the author of the Acts had ever seen St. Paul's Epistles. If we were to borrow our opponents' language, we might say that St. Luke absolutely 'knew nothing' of these letters. We can find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in 1 Peter, clear proofs of acquaintance with Paul's letters; but not so in the Acts. Can we imagine a compiler of the next century so subtle as to give the speeches which he puts in Paul's mouth a Pauline character, by employing that Apostle's vocabulary, and yet avoiding anything like a direct echo of any passage in the Epistles? The nearest coincidence I can find is that in the speech at Athens, Paul says (xvii. 31), 'He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead.' This is like what Paul says in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans (i. 4), 'Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:' so like at least that we can easily believe both to have been utterances of the same man; yet the likeness is certainly not that of direct imitation. If the antiquity of the book of Acts were undoubted, and that of Paul's Epistles disputed, I am persuaded that our opponents would not admit the validity of a single proof we could produce of St. Luke's acquaintance with those Epistles, while they could make out a very strong case to prove his ignorance.

For example, Philippi is a place where, as I already remarked, the author of the 'we' sections spent a considerable time; and its Church would, therefore, be one in which he would take a lively interest. Yet he shows no sign of acquaintance with the letter which, at a period a little later than that included in the history of the Acts, Paul wrote to the Philippian Church. In the account given in the Acts of the formation of that Church, Lydia is the only person mentioned by name. If the Epistle had been forged by anyone

who had seen the Acts, that name would surely have been found in it; but it is absent. On the other hand, there is not a word in the Acts about Epaphroditus, about the women Euodia and Syntyche, about the name Clement, afterwards so celebrated, about the gifts of money sent by the Philippian Church to Paul at Thessalonica (Phil. iv. 16; see also 2 Cor. xi. 9).* Thus the independence of the Acts and this Epistle is clearly marked; but at what an early date must each writing have been composed, if the author of neither had seen the other?

Take again the Epistle to the Galatians. The main topic of the assailants of the Acts is the assertion that the book contradicts that Epistle. I do not admit that there is any real contradiction, but I think also that St. Luke when he wrote had not seen that Epistle. There are some things mentioned in it, such as Paul's journey to Arabia, the rebuke of Paul to Peter at Antioch, the dispute concerning the circumcision of Titus, which I think St. Luke would scarcely have passed over in silence had he known that Epistle. Now a writer of the second century could neither have been ignorant of that Epistle himself, nor could he flatter himself that his readers could be so. Thus the excuse will not serve that he omitted these things in order to conceal from his readers that there ever had been any variance between Paul and the original Apostles. If that had been his object, he would have repeated the same stories with some different colouring; but he would not have resorted to the ostrich-like device of being silent about things told in a book which he knew his readers had in their hands. But while I find it hard to think that the author of the Acts could have been acquainted with the Epistle to the Galatians, I see no difficulty in the supposition that he was ignorant of it. If Luke had not been with Paul at the time he wrote that letter, then unless Paul kept a copy of it, or unless the Galatian Church sent him back a copy of his own

* Bishop FitzGerald used to think there was an oblique reference to the Macedonian gifts in *συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ* (Acts xviii. 5); the meaning being that these gifts freed Paul from the necessity of working at his trade, and enabled him to devote himself entirely to the preaching of the word. Canon Cook gives the same explanation in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

letter, one of Paul's immediate companions was just one of the last persons in the Church to be likely to see it.

Again, it seems to me probable that Luke, when he wrote, had not seen the Epistles to the Corinthians. Surely if he had read 1 Cor. xv. 6, 7, his Gospel would have told something of our Lord's appearance to James and to the five hundred brethren at once; and if he had read 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25, the Acts would have given some particulars about the five times when in the synagogue Paul received forty stripes save one, of the three beatings with rods, and the three shipwrecks. In the case of 1 Cor., however, we have the strongest token that has been found of indebtedness on Luke's part to Pauline epistles, viz. the close resemblance between the words in which the institution of the Eucharist is recorded in that Epistle and in the Gospel. I am myself inclined to explain that resemblance by the liturgical use of the words. Luke would probably have often heard Paul when conducting divine service recite the words of Institution, and so they would come into his Gospel in the same form. One other phrase is cited, 'Whatsoever is set before you eat' (1 Cor. x. 27), which nearly coincides with the words in the direction to the Seventy (Luke x. 8), 'Eat such things as are set before you,' *ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν*. If the coincidence is more than accidental, I should ascribe it to the adoption as his own, by St. Paul, of well-known words of our Lord. But the question whether Luke might have seen one or two Epistles of St. Paul is one which I have no interest in contesting. However that be decided, two facts remain. First, the Acts say nothing as to Paul's having written letters. Now, if the Acts had been compiled after these letters had obtained general circulation, the compiler would at least have mentioned, as every modern biographer of Paul does, the fact of their composition, even if he had nothing to tell about the circumstances which drew them forth. When speaking, for example, of Paul's residence in Corinth, he would have noted that thence Paul wrote his Epistle to the Church of Rome. Biographers of St. John, of whom I shall speak in the next lecture, do not fail to tell the circumstances under which he wrote his Gospel. But to the author of the Acts St. Paul is

known, not as a writer, but as a man of action. We conclude, then, that this book must have been written before the period when Paul's letters had passed from being the special property of the several Churches to which they were addressed, and had become the general property of Christians. Secondly, the Acts not only do not mention Paul's epistles, but show very scanty signs of acquaintance with them. It follows, then, that the familiarity with Paul's diction which the writer confessedly exhibits, if not obtained from a study of his letters, must have been derived from close personal intercourse.

The language of Peter's speeches in the Acts has also been compared with that of Peter's First Epistle, the result being to elicit several coincidences. Thus the idea that Jesus was delivered by the determinate counsel of God occurs three times in Peter's speeches (ii. 23, iv. 28, x. 42), and is found in the Epistle (i. 2, 20; ii. 4, 6). The prophecy (Ps. cxviii. 22) of our Lord, as the stone set at nought by the builders, is quoted (Acts iv. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 6). And generally the Petrine speeches in the Acts agree with the Epistle in their thorough harmony with Paul's doctrine. But whether that is a reason for doubting their authenticity had better be postponed until I come to discuss the Epistle.

I have thought that the most important point on which to dwell in the limited time at my disposal is the proof that the compiler of the Acts was a companion of St. Paul. If this were not established it would be useless to give proofs of Luke's accuracy in particulars, and of his exact knowledge of localities. It would simply be said that the compiler had access to some very good sources of information. I may, however, give you a few specimens of the argument into the details of which I am not able to enter. On one point, for instance, on which Luke's accuracy had been questioned, further investigation has confirmed it. Sergius Paulus is described (xiii. 7) as proconsul (ἀνθύπατος) at Cyprus. Now, we learn from Strabo (XIV. xvii. 25) that there were two classes of provinces in the Roman empire, as arranged by Augustus: one, the ruler of which was appointed by the Senate; the other, where military operations were likely to be necessary, the ruler of which was appointed by the

emperor. The ruler of a senatorial province bore the title of Proconsul; that of an imperial province was called Propræ-tor (*ἀντιστράτηγος*). Strabo further informs us that Cyprus was governed by *στρατηγοί*. Hence it was inferred that these were styled proprætors, and that Cyprus therefore was one of the provinces which Augustus had reserved for himself; so it had been set down as a mistake of Luke's that he called the governor proconsul. But Strabo expressly places Cyprus on the list of senatorial provinces; and it is certain that the *στρατηγοί*, by whom he tells us Cyprus was governed, bore the title of Proconsul, and were prætors only as regards their previous rank. This is clearly stated by Dion Cassius, who further informs us (liii. 12, liv. 4) that though Cyprus had been at first on Augustus's list, a rectification was subse-quently made by him, the disturbed province of Dalmatia, which had been assigned to the Senate, having been ex-changed for quiet provinces in the emperor's portion; and that at that time Cyprus reverted to the Senate. This is confirmed by coins and other remains,* showing that down to and after the time of Paul's visit the governor of Cyprus bore the title of Proconsul. It may be mentioned that Pliny, in his Natural History, for two books, II. and XVIII., quotes the authority of a Sergius Paulus. The name is not so un-common as to make an identification certain; yet, since in each of the two books for which he cites the name Pliny tells something about the natural history of Cyprus, it is likely enough that the same person is meant. At several of the other places which Paul visited we have equal accuracy in the description of the magistrates. At Corinth, Gallio is described as *ἀνθύπατος* (Acts xviii. 12). This was in the reign of Claudius. Under Tiberius, Achaia was imperial; under Nero it was independent; under Claudius it was senatorial, as represented by St. Luke (see Tacit. *Ann.* i. 76; Sueton., *Claudius*, 25). In Ephesus the mention of *ἀνθύπατοι* (xix. 38)

* In Cesnola's *Cyprus* an inscription is given (p. 425) in which the words ΕΠΙ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ [ΑΝΘ]ΥΠΑΤΟΥ occur. This may have been the Sergius Paulus of St. Luke. I derive this reference, as well as other of the points noted above, from an article by Bp. Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, May, 1878.

is equally correct. At Thessalonica, again, the magistrates are called politarchs (Acts xvii. 6). Now this name is found in connexion with Thessalonica in no ancient author; but an arch which to this day spans the main street of the city bears the inscription that it had been raised by the seven politarchs.* It is a curious coincidence, but one on which nothing can be built, that among their names we find Gaius, Secundus, and Sosipater—all three names occurring in Acts xx. 4, and that of Secundus in connexion with Thessalonica. St. Luke mentions also the Demos of Thessalonica, an appropriate word in speaking of a free city. Στρατηγοί, prætors, seems a very grand title for the two magistrates of the little provincial city of Philippi (Acts xvi. 20); but Cicero, in one of his orations† a hundred years earlier, laughs at the magistrates of an Italian provincial town who had the impudence to call themselves prætors; and no doubt what happened then was very likely to happen again. That Philippi was a *Colonia* (Acts xvi. 12) is confirmed by Dion Cassius (li. 4). The governor of Melita is neither Proconsul nor Proprætor, but head-man, πρῶτος, a title the accuracy of which is attested by inscriptions (Boeckh, No. 5754). Luke's mention of Iconium is noteworthy (Acts xiii. 51). Just before (xiii. 13), he has described Perga as 'of Pamphylia,' Antioch as 'of Pisidia:' just after (xiv. 6), Lystra and Derbe as '*the* cities of Lycaonia.' Iconium alone is named without geographical designation. Now it seems likely that Iconium was at the time extra-provincial; for Paul's contemporary Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* v. 25) distinguishes it from Lycaonia proper as the chief of fourteen cities which formed an independent tetrarchy.‡

Before leaving the subject of the Acts, I may mention one

---

* Boeckh, *Inscr. Gr.* No. 1967; Leake's *Northern Greece*, III. 236.

† *De Leg. Agrar. contra Rullum*, § xxxiv. See also Hor. *Sat.* I. v. 34.

‡ I owe this remark to Dr. Gwynn, who has also observed with regard to the titles of provincial magistrates, that the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (see next lecture), show how easy it was for a later writer to go wrong in this matter. The 'proconsul' at Antioch in these Acts (§ 32) is clearly a mistake; for the Syrian Antioch is meant, and Syria was not a Senatorial Province. The case of the 'proconsul' at Iconium (§§ 16–20) is less clear. Iconium apparently had its own tetrarch (see above);

of the newest attacks on it—so new, indeed, that the author of *Supernatural Religion* had not discovered it when he published his volume on the Acts in 1877; but shortly after, having met an article by Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1873, he communicated an abstract of it to the *Fortnightly Review*, Oct., 1877. St. Luke had been accused of certain historical blunders, the evidence being that he is on certain points at variance with Josephus; for, of course, it is assumed that, if there be a difference, Josephus is right and Luke wrong. But Holtzmann imagined himself to have discovered that Luke made use of the work of Josephus, and consequently wrote later; and therefore not till after the close of the first century. It is amusing to find that the main part of the proof is, that the names of different public characters mentioned by St. Luke are also mentioned by Josephus; for example, Annas and Caiaphas, Gamaliel, Herod, Felix, Festus, &c. In the same way we can prove that the political tracts ascribed to Dean Swift were in reality written in the reign of George III.; for they mention Queen Anne, the Duke of Marlborough, Harley, and St. John, showing clearly that the author must have read Smollett's History of England. The author of *Supernatural Religion* strengthens the proof by finding spread over eleven or more sections of Josephus some of the words which occur in three verses of St. Luke's preface. But in truth a man unacquainted with the literature of the period is as incompetent to say whether the occurrence of the same words in different authors is a proof of literary obligation, as a negro who had never seen more than two white men in his life would be to say whether their likeness to each other was a proof of close relationship. Thus Luke could have found in the Septuagint the greater part of the words he is accused of borrowing from Josephus. Others

possibly its Duumviri, as a *Colonia* (Boeckh, 3991, 3993; Eckhel, *Doctr. Numm. Vet.* III. 32; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverw., Band I., Zweiter Abschnitt* B., XXX.), or if counted as of Lycaonia, it would belong, at different times, to Galatia (Strabo, XII. v. 1; vi. 1), to Cappadocia (Ptolemy, v. 6), to Asia (Pliny, *ut supr.* [?], Boeckh, 3188). Of these, Asia alone was a Senatorial Province. If, however, the proconsul of Asia were intended, this great official would not be found within call of a plaintiff in a third-rate and outlying city of his province.

again (αὐτόπτης for example), as Dr. Hobart has shown (*Medical Language of St. Luke*, pp. 87–90), belong to the vocabulary of Greek medical writers. Galen's prefaces have closer affinities with St. Luke's than have those of Josephus.* Thus we find in Galen's prefaces the complimentary epithet κράτιστε, the commencement by ἐπειδή with δοκεῖ for apodosis, the phrases ἀκριβῶς παρακολουθῆσαι and ἐπιχειρεῖν. Several of the words on which an argument has been built are the common property of all who use the Greek language. One of the words which it is assumed Luke could not have known unless he had learned it from Josephus is actually τύπτω; which would raise the question, if the doubt had not occurred to one before, whether the objector had ever seen a Greek grammar. Perhaps the highest point of laughable absurdity is reached by Krenkel (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1873, p. 441), who thinks that Luke would not have known how to describe our Lord as a παῖς ἐτῶν δώδεκα if Josephus had not spoken of his own proficiency when he was παῖς περὶ τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατον ἔτος. Krenkel suggests that Luke altered the 14 of Josephus into 12, because the latter was a sacred number. No doubt, if the difference had been the other way, it would have been found that twice seven was the sacred number.

Though Luke and Josephus frequently mention the same people, the discrepancies between them are as remarkable as the coincidences. For instance, the 'Egyptian' who in Acts xxi. 38 leads out 4000 Sicarii is in *Bell. Jud.* II. xiii. 5 at the head of 30,000; and so on. Anyone, therefore, who says that Luke read Josephus is bound to say also that Luke was a very careless person who remembered very little of what he read. And the best critics of the sceptical school have found themselves unable to execute the change of front from accusing Luke of contradicting Josephus to accusing him of having copied him.

* Galen wrote in the latter half of the second century, but his writings may be taken as probable evidence of the usage of previous medical writers. The use of ἐπιχειρεῖν, as above, is found in Hippocrates some centuries earlier, as Dr. Hobart has pointed out.

XIX.

APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

IN discussing the relation between St. Matthew's Gospel and the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, I was led, in a former lecture, to speak of other non-canonical gospels; and thus I have come to include in the plan of these lectures an account not only of the writings which have obtained admission into the New Testament Canon, but also of those which at any time seemed to have pretensions to find their way into it.*

This, then, would seem to be the place to treat of Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles; but though there is great abundance of legendary tales of Apostolic labours and miracles, there is scarcely any extant document, which either on the ground of antiquity or of extent of acceptance, can make remote pretensions to canonical authority. If we were to

* Until comparatively lately the most important collection of such writings was that by Fabricius (*Codex Apocryphus, N.T.*, Hamburg, 1719). In 1832 a new Codex Apocryphus was commenced by Thilo, but he did not publish more than the first volume containing Apocryphal Gospels. A collection of Apocryphal Acts was published by Tischendorf in 1851, followed by Apocryphal Gospels in 1853, 2nd edit. 1876, and by a volume containing Apocryphal Revelations and some supplements to his volume of Acts in 1866. Syriac *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* have been made accessible by Professor Wm. Wright (London, 1871). A very important addition to our sources of information will be made in Max Bonnett's *Supplementum Codicis Apocryphi*, of which the first part containing the Acts of St. Thomas appeared in 1883. A complete account of all that is known on the subject will be found in Lipsius's *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1883, a work in two large volumes.

Lipsius, Rd. A., born 1830, Professor of Theology at Jena. Though differing in opinion from him on many important points, I cannot forbear to acknowledge the obligations students owe to his ability, learning, and industry.

judge by the number of New Testament books which modern critics have rejected as spurious, we should be led to think that the early Church was extremely easy in admitting the claims of any document which aspired to a place in the Canon. But actually we find cause to admire the extreme rigour of the scrutiny to which any such claim was subjected.

We have already seen that the two minor Epistles of St. John (whose common authorship with the First Epistle there is no good reason to doubt) did not find acceptance at once, or without controversy. Like hesitation was shown (and as I believe without any just cause) in the case of St. James's Epistle, of which I have still to speak. And though the story of the labours and sufferings of the first preachers of the Gospel constituted the reading which Christians found at once most interesting and most edifying, it does not appear that anyone dreamed of setting any record of Apostolic labours on a level with that made by St. Luke. The consequence was, that this branch of Christian literature, being not interfered with or controlled by ecclesiastical authority, became liable to great variations of form. Successive relators of these stories modified them to suit their respective tastes or to express their doctrinal views; so that now it is often a difficult and uncertain task for critical sagacity to recover the original form of the legends. The difficulty is increased by the number of the documents that demand investigation, much still remaining to be done for a complete examination of the Greek and Latin lives to be found in Western libraries, while considerable addition to the stock of materials may be expected from Oriental sources.

That the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles should be subjected to some alterations and recastings was indeed a necessity resulting from the fact that it was in heretical circles that the majority took their origin. I have already (Lect. II.) spoken of the Clementines, which were in fact Ebionite Acts of Peter. There was still more active manufacture of apocryphal literature among the Gnostics, some of whom displayed great fertility of invention, and had tales to tell of wonders wrought by the Apostles which had as lively interest for the

orthodox as for the heretics. So members of the Catholic Church who met with these Gnostic Acts found it easy to believe that the facts related in them were in the main true, however much they might have been disfigured by heretical additions.* And then it was a natural step to expurgate these Acts, cancelling as spurious what was found distasteful to orthodox feelings, or giving the story some modification which would remove the offence. For instance, Encratism is a prominent feature of the Gnostic Acts. The married life is treated as absolutely unlawful. The Apostolic preachers are represented as having done a good work, when a couple about to unite in wedlock have been prevailed on to abandon the design, or when a wife has been persuaded to refuse further intercourse with her husband. The persecution which the Christian preachers meet with is frequently represented as arising from the natural resentment of husbands at such teaching. When these stories are repeated by an orthodox narrator, the heretical character of the Encratism is removed. The woman who separates herself is not a wife but a concubine; or there is some impediment of close kindred; or the separation is not intended to be permanent, but is only a temporary withdrawal for purposes of devotion, or in order more closely to attend to the Apostolic preaching.

I. There is no heretical taint in the work which I take first to describe, and which related the preaching of Addai or Thaddæus, to Abgarus, king of Edessa. I place it first because we have an assurance of the antiquity of the story in the fact that Eusebius accepted it as authentic, and gave an abstract of it, at the end of the first book of his *Ecclesiastical History*. He states that he derived his account from records written in Syriac, preserved in the archives of the city of Edessa. This city, the capital of Osrhoene, the northern province of Mesopotamia, was for a long period a centre of theological

* The preface of the pseudo-Melito to his 'Passion of St. John,' in words reproduced in a forged letter of Jerome to Chromatius and Heliodorus, exemplifies the opinion of an orthodox reviser concerning the work of his heretical predecessor: 'Quædam de virtutibus quidem [et miraculis], quæ per eos Dominus fecit, vera dixit; de doctrina vero multa mentitus est.' Thus, by a curious reversal of modern canons of belief, the rule is, Believe all the miraculous part of the story, and disbelieve the rest.

culture for Syriac-speaking Christians. It boasted with pride of the early date at which it had received the Gospel; and in time it was believed to have derived special privileges from the reception by its king of a letter from our Saviour's own hand. The barbarians should never be able to take the city. No idolater, no Jew, no heretic could live in it. With these privileges, however, we are not immediately concerned, since the belief in them is of later origin than the story with which I have to do. This is that Abgar, one of several successive rulers of Edessa who bore this name, being afflicted with a sore disease, and having heard of the mighty deeds of Jesus, who cured sicknesses by the power of his word alone, and who even raised the dead, sent ambassadors to Him with a letter, of which Eusebius gives a translation. In this he expresses his belief that Jesus must be either God or the Son of God; and he begs Him to have pity on him and heal his disease. He has heard of the plots which the Jews are contriving against Jesus, and offers Him refuge in his city, which though small is of good consideration and well sufficient for them both. Eusebius gives also a translation of what purports to be a letter from our Lord in answer. In some versions of the story our Lord's answer is verbal: in others the verbal answer is turned into a letter by the Apostle Thomas. It begins, 'Blessed art thou who hast believed in me without having seen me; for it is written of me that they who have seen me shall not believe me, and that they who have not seen me shall believe and live.' There seems to be here a clear use of John xx. 29. The nearest Old Testament passage is Is. lii. 15, and the resemblance to that is not very close. The letter goes on to say that our Lord must finish all the things for which He had been sent, and afterwards be taken up to Him that had sent Him; but that, after He had been taken up, He would send one of His disciples, who should heal his disease and give life to him and his people. Then the story relates that after our Lord's Ascension, the Apostle Judas, also called Thomas, sent Thaddæus, one of the Seventy, who preached to Abgar and healed him of his disease, the king declaring that he had already so believed in Jesus that if it had not been for the power of the Romans, he would have gone with an army

to destroy the Jews who had crucified Jesus. Thaddæus teaches him the cause why our Lord had been sent into the world, and tells him of our Lord's mighty work, and of the mysteries which He spoke to the world; how He abased Himself and humbled His Divinity, and was crucified, and descended into Hades, and clove the wall of partition which from eternity had never been cleft, and brought up the dead. For He descended alone, but ascended with many to His Father.* Eusebius concludes his abstract by telling that Abgar offered Thaddæus silver and gold; but he refused, saying, How shall we who have abandoned our own property take that which belongs to others? He gives the date, the year 340—that is of the Seleucian era, corresponding to the year 28 or 29 of ours.

Either the book from which Eusebius made his extracts, or an amplification of it, is still extant in Syriac. It is called *The Teaching of Addai*, and was edited, with an English translation, by Dr. Phillips, in 1876. It contains, with only trifling variations, all that is cited by Eusebius; but it contains a good deal more. For example, the letter of our Lord concludes with a promise of inviolability to the city of Edessa. There is a story of which you must have heard, but about which Eusebius is silent, that one of Abgar's ambassadors, being the royal painter, took a picture of our Lord and brought it back with him to Edessa. There is a correspondence between Abgar and the Emperor Tiberius, in which Abgar urges the Roman emperor to punish the Jews for the murder of our Lord; and Tiberius answers that he had disgraced Pilate for his share in the crime, but that he was prevented by troubles in Spain from taking immediate steps against the Jews. And there is a story about Protonice, the wife of the Emperor Claudius, almost identical with that told of Constantine's mother Helena, namely, that she sought for our Lord's cross, and, finding three, was enabled to distinguish the right one by applying them successively to a dead body, which was unaffected by the touch of the crosses of the two thieves,

* This recognizes the story of the 'harrowing of hell,' told in the Gospel of Nicodemus (see p. 201).

but was restored to life when touched by that of our Lord. It is a question whether Eusebius designedly omitted all this matter, or whether it was added since his time. Lipsius, who has made a special study of this story,* decides in favour of the latter supposition, a conclusion which I have no inclination to dispute. He dates the original document used by Eusebius A. D. 250, and the enlargement about 360. I have already (see p. 83) had occasion to refer to one of the proofs that the document is not earlier than the third century, viz. that it represents Addai as using the Diatessaron in the public service. The reading of Paul's Epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles is also especially mentioned (p. 44).†

II. The work which I next consider might, on chronological grounds, have been placed first, for it has earlier attestation and was earlier written: the Acts of Paul and Thecla. In this story, as I shall presently tell, Thecla is related to have baptized herself, and consequently her case was cited against Tertullian in the controversy whether or not it was permissible for females to baptize. He disposes of the citation (*De Baptismo*, 17) by denying the authenticity of the book; and makes the interesting statement that a presbyter in Asia had confessed his authorship of the work, pleading that he had made it through love of Paul, whereupon he was deposed from his office. Thus we learn that the story of Thecla was current in the second century; and I know no good reason for doubting that it was, in its main substance, the same as that contained in the Acts now extant. Notwithstanding Tertullian's rejection, the story of Thecla is used as genuine by a whole host of fathers: Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others.‡ Though Eusebius does not directly

* *Die edessenische Abgarsage*, 1880.

† Bishop Reeves tells me that no inference, as to the currency of the Thaddæus legend in Ireland, can be drawn from the common use of the name Thady: this being but the representative of a Celtic name, signifying 'poet,' and also known in the form Teigue.

‡ Ambrose *de Virginibus* II.; August. *Contra Faust.* xxx. 4; Greg. Nyss. *Hom.* 14 *in Cantic. Canticor.*; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxiv. *in Laud. S. Cypr.* 10, *Præcept. ad Virgg.* v. 190; Epiphan. *Hær.* lxxviii. 16; Chrys. *in Act., Hom.* 25.

mention Thecla, he shows his knowledge of her story by calling another Thecla ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς Θέκλα (*Mart. Pal.* 3). His contemporary Methodius, in his *Symposium*, makes Thecla the victor in the contest of virgins. The Acts were translated into Latin, Syriac, and Arabic.

These Acts of Paul and Thecla are deeply tinged with Encratism. This sufficiently appears from the following specimen of Paul's preaching: 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are they who keep the flesh undefiled, for they shall become the temple of God. Blessed are the continent (οἱ ἐγκρατεῖς), for God shall speak unto them. Blessed are they who renounce this world, for they shall be called upright. Blessed are they who have wives as though they had them not, for they shall inherit God. . . . Blessed are the bodies of the virgins, for they shall be well pleasing to God, and shall not lose the reward of their chastity.' This sermon is delivered by Paul in the house of his host Onesiphorus at Iconium, where the story opens. The virgin Thecla overhears it from the window of her neighbouring house, and is delighted with the Apostle's praises of virginity. She hangs 'like a spider' at the window for three days and nights together, not leaving it either to eat or to drink, until her mother in despair sends for Thecla's affianced husband Thamyris, the chief man of the city. But his interference is in vain; Thecla has no ears for anyone but Paul.

Thamyris, going out, meets two of Paul's companions, Demas and Hermogenes, men full of hypocrisy, and asks them who this deceiver was who forbade marriages to take place. They tell him that Paul robbed young men of their wives, and maidens of their husbands, teaching them, 'Ye have no part in the Resurrection unless ye remain chaste and do not defile your flesh;' but they teach him that the Resurrection has already taken place, consisting in the generation of children, and in the obtaining the knowledge of the true God.

I may remark in passing that the use of the names Onesiphorus, Demas, and Hermogenes, the parts ascribed to these characters, and the doctrine about the Resurrection

being past already, show clearly that the writer of these Acts had read the Second Epistle to Timothy with which his work has other verbal coincidences. These last coincidences might, perhaps, be explained away as arising from additions made by an orthodox reviser; but a reviser would not be likely to alter the names of the characters. Onesiphorus is described as seeking for Paul (2 Tim. i. 17), and you may care to hear the description by which he had been taught to recognize the Apostle. He was a man of small stature, with bald head, bow-legged, of a healthy complexion (εὐεκτικός), with eyebrows joined together, and a somewhat aquiline nose (μικρῶς ἐπίρινος).* I have only mentioned the coincidences with 2 Timothy because this is a disputed book. These Acts are full of coincidences with the New Testament. You may have noticed two in the fragment of Paul's sermon which I quoted, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,' and 'they that have wives, as though they had none.'

At the instigation of the false disciples, Paul is arraigned before the proconsul; but the first night of his imprisonment Thecla, by gifts of her personal ornaments, bribes the porter of her own house to let her out, and the jailer to let her in, and sits at Paul's feet and receives his instruction. There she is found; and when Paul is brought before the tribunal she is sent for, too; but when examined by the proconsul she makes no answer, having no eyes or ears for any but Paul. Though the proconsul had been willing to listen to the Christian doctrine preached by Paul, he now condemns him as a magician, and has him whipped out of the city. As for Thecla, her own mother pronounces that she ought to be burned, in order that other women might learn not to follow so bad an example; and burned she accordingly would have been if the pyre had not miraculously been quenched. Escaping from the city, Thecla finds Paul, who with his company had been

* On this description have been founded the representations of Paul's appearance given by several later writers. The following is Renan's version: 'Il était laid, de courte taille, épais et voûté. Ses fortes épaules portaient bizarrement une tête petite et chauve. Sa face blême était comme envahie par une barbe épaisse, un nez aquilin, des yeux perçants des sourcils noirs qui se rejoignaient sur le front.'—*Les Apôtres*, p. 170.

fasting and praying for her deliverance. Onesiphorus was with him, but he had parted with all his goods; so when, after six days' fasting, they can hold out no longer, Paul has to sell his upper garment in order to buy the bread and herbs which, with water, constituted their fare. Thecla begs that she may travel with Paul whithersoever he went; but he replies, 'Nay, for the time is evil, and thou of fair form, lest another temptation worse than the former come on thee and thou not be able to resist.' 'Give me,' she said, 'the seal in Christ, and no temptation shall touch me.' And Paul answered, 'Thecla, be patient, and thou shalt receive the water.'

She accompanies him then to Antioch, where her beauty excites the passion of the Syriarch Alexander, and brings on her new trials. In consequence of her resistance to him, she is brought before the governor, and condemned to the wild beasts. In the meantime she obtains that the virginity for which she was willing to undergo so much should be preserved, and is committed to the charge of a lady, Tryphæna, who later in the story is spoken of as a queen and as a relation of the emperor. Tryphæna receives her to take the place of her deceased daughter, and Thecla requites the service by efficacious prayers, which transfer the soul of this dead heathen to the place of bliss. The lioness to whom Thecla is first exposed not only licks her feet and refuses to touch her, but defends her against the other animals let loose on her. But when, after having killed some of the assailants, the faithful lioness herself is slain, Thecla, seeing no further escape, jumps into a tank where seals are kept, crying, as she does so, 'I am baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the Last Day.' Thereupon the sea monsters fall dead, and Thecla is surrounded with a cloud of fire, so that neither can the beasts touch her nor her nakedness be seen. I need not pursue the history. When Paul takes leave of her, he bids her go teach the word of God; and she continues to a great age at Seleucia, living on herbs and water, and there enlightening many people with the word of God. Unless the last ἐφώτισεν is to be understood to mean 'baptized,' there is no mention in the Acts, as they stand now, of Thecla's baptizing anyone but herself. Jerome, however, speaks contemptuously of the Acts of Thecla, as

containing a story of a baptized lion (*De Viris Illust.* 7). Either this was a hallucination of memory on Jerome's part (which I think by no means impossible, his story being absolutely without confirmation), or this incident was expurgated from the version of these Acts which has reached us.

If we had not Tertullian's testimony that these Acts were composed by a Church presbyter, against whom he brings no charge of heresy, I should certainly refer them to the class of Gnostic Acts, with which they have many features in common. The exaltation of virginity seems to proceed as far as to a condemnation of marriage, and to a denial to married persons of a share in the Resurrection. The account of the Apostolic company abandoning their worldly goods, and living on bread and water, has certainly an Encratite complexion. There is an account of an appearance to Thecla of our Lord in Paul's form which much resembles what we read in confessedly Gnostic Acts; while also a favourite incident in such Acts is the obedience of brute animals to the word of the Christian preachers. I think these Acts must have possessed these features from the first; for I know no example of Gnostic recasting of Acts originally orthodox. Neither again can I look on these Acts as an orthodox recasting of Gnostic Acts; for I find nothing in them which looks like a softening of something originally more heretical. I therefore accept the present as the original form of the Acts, and am willing to believe, on Tertullian's authority, that they were the work of a Church presbyter. But I think he must have worked on Gnostic lines. From the manner in which Tertullian speaks, I should date the composition of the Acts which he rejects some twenty or thirty years before his own time—that is, about 170 or 180—and I believe that by that time Gnostic Acts had been published which might have served this writer as a model. I think that if the tendency of the work had been felt by the Church of the time to be quite unobjectionable, the author would scarcely have been deposed for his composition of what he could have represented as an edifying fiction not intended to deceive. But there is nothing surprising in the fact that anything of heretical aspect in the book should afterwards be overlooked or condoned. Some extravagance

of statement is easily pardoned to good men struggling against real evils. At the present day, one point of Encratite doctrine—the absolute unlawfulness of the use of wine—is insisted on by men who find sympathy and respect from many who cannot be persuaded that the lawfulness of use is disproved by the possibility of abuse. At the end of the second century it was not merely that Christians saw their brethren in danger of being seduced by the immoralities of heathendom, 'lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries;' there were those who laid claim to the Christian name who covered that name with disgrace. A later school of Gnostics drew from the doctrine of the essential evil of matter quite different consequences from those of their ascetic predecessors. Instead of hoping by mortification of the body to lighten the weight that pressed down the soul, those men taught that it was folly to strive to purify what was in its nature impure beyond remedy. He who was truly enlightened would have knowledge to perceive that the soul could not be affected by the deeds of its grosser companion, but that he might give the flesh the gratification which it craved, and fear not that his spirit should suffer defilement. If men, fighting against these abominations, forgot caution and moderation, they would not be judged very harshly.

The extant Acts agree very well with Tertullian's account that their author was a presbyter of Asia; for it is in Asia Minor, and in those parts of it which adjoin Asia proper, that the scene of nearly the whole story is laid. Von Gutschmid has made interesting researches, showing that the names of royal personages which occur in apocryphal Acts are often those of real people; and he has proved by the evidence of coins that there really was a Queen Tryphæna, who conceivably might have been in Antioch at the time of Paul's visit.* I have only to remark, in conclusion, that these Acts show no

* '*Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*' (Rhein. Museum, 1864, xix. 178). She was the divorced wife of Polemo II., king of Bosporus; and Gutschmid ingeniously gives reasons for thinking that she was a descendant of the celebrated Cleopatra and Mark Antony, so that she and the Emperor Claudius had a common ancestor.

signs of acquaintance with any struggle between Paulinists and anti-Paulinists, the author being evidently unconscious that there can be any in the Church who do not share his admiration for Paul.

III. In order to let you better see the affinities of the story of Thecla with Gnostic Acts, I take next in order the Acts of St. Thomas, the remains of which are very complete, and their Gnostic character beyond mistake. They include, indeed, some hymns, copied in all simplicity by orthodox transcribers, who, being ignorant of Gnostic mythology, did not understand what was meant, but which betray their heretical origin at once to those who are acquainted with Gnostic speculations.

Among the books read by Photius* (*Bibl.* 114), was a volume purporting to be written by Leucius Charinus, and containing the travels† of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul. Photius describes the book as both foolish and heretical. It taught the existence of two Gods—an evil one, the God of the Jews, having Simon Magus for his minister; and a good one, whom, confounding the Divine Persons, it identified with Christ. It denied the reality of Christ's Incarnation, and gave a docetic account of His life on earth, and in particular of His crucifixion; it condemned marriage, and regarded all generation as the work of the evil principle; and it told several silly and childish stories. We can satisfactorily trace these Acts back to the fourth century by means of references in writers of that date. At that time they were chiefly in use among the Manicheans; yet there are grounds for looking on them as more ancient than that heresy, which

* Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 858, had previously been sent by the Emperor on an embassy to Bagdad. For the information of his brother Tarasius, with whom he had been in the habit of reading, he made abstracts of the contents of the books he read during his absence, criticizing their style and doctrine, and sometimes giving extracts from them. Thus was formed his *Bibliotheca*, containing an account of no fewer than 280 different works, a book which fills us with admiration of the ability and learning of this indefatigable student, and to which we owe our knowledge of several works now no longer extant.

† The stichometry of Nicephorus (see p. 178) contains a record of the number of *στίχοι* in the travels of Peter, John, and Thomas, respectively, viz. 2750, 2600, 1700.

only began towards the end of the third century. We do not find, indeed, the name of Leucius in any writer earlier than the fourth century; yet earlier writers show acquaintance with stories which we know to have been in the Leucian Acts; whence the conclusion has been drawn, which seems to me a probable one, that these Acts are really a second century production, and that they found favour with the Manicheans on account of the affinity of their doctrines.

It is mainly for the light they throw on Gnostic ideas that the Acts of Thomas deserve to be studied; for they are a mere romance, without any historic value. The name Thomas signifies 'twin,' and in these Acts the Apostle's proper name is given as Judas. The name Judas Thomas appears also in the Edessan Acts, and may have been derived from these. But in these Acts we are startled to find that the twin of the Apostle is no other than our Blessed Lord Himself, the likeness of the two being such as to cause one to be taken for the other. I have already noticed the parallel story of the appearance of our Lord to Thecla under the shape of Paul. The Acts begin by telling how the Apostles cast lots for the quarter of the world to which each was to preach the Gospel, and that India fell to the lot of Thomas. This story of a division of the field of labour among the Apostles by lot* is very ancient. It was known to Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 1), who, in the passage referred to, is quoting Origen. It is noteworthy that Eusebius there names the districts obtained by the very five Apostles whose travels are said by Photius to have been related by Leucius. He assigns their districts—Parthia to Thomas, Scythia to Andrew, Asia to John. Origen's account of the mission of the other two Apostles has the air of being rather taken from the Bible than from Apocryphal Acts, viz. Peter to the Jews dispersed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; St. Paul, from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum; it being added that both Apostles ended their lives by martyrdom at Rome. In the Gnostic Acts the allotment of labour among the Apostles is regarded

* I think Lipsius is right in supposing that this story was suggested by the casting of lots (Acts i. 23).

as having happened very soon after the Ascension; but what is apparently an earlier account represents the Apostles as forbidden to leave Jerusalem for twelve* years. Such is the account of the second-century writer Apollonius (*Euseb.* v. 18); and we learn from Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 5), that the story was contained in the apocryphal *Preaching of Peter and Paul.*

The Acts of Thomas relate that when India fell to the lot of that Apostle he refused to go, notwithstanding that our Lord, in a vision, encouraged him. He was weak in the flesh, and how should a Hebrew preach the truth to the Indians? It happened that there was then in Jerusalem a merchant from India, charged by King Gundaphorus† to buy him a carpenter. Our Lord met this man, and told him He could sell him a slave of His, who was a very good workman, and He sold him Thomas accordingly. The merchant finding Thomas, showed him Jesus, and asked him, 'Is this your master?' 'Yes, he is my Lord,' was the reply. 'Then I have bought you from Him.' So Thomas acquiesced in his Lord's will.

The first recorded incident of his travels is that, at a city where the ship touched, the King was making a marriage for his only daughter; and everyone, rich or poor, bond or free, native or foreigner, was required to attend the feast. I cannot delay to tell what took place at it, save that Thomas refused to eat or to drink. But, in consequence of a miracle‡ which he performed, he was brought in by the King to bless the newly-married couple. When strangers had retired from the chamber, and the bridegroom lifted the curtain which separated him from his bride, he saw Thomas, as he supposed, conversing with her. Then he asked in surprise, 'How canst thou be found here? Did I not see thee go out before all?' And the Lord answered, 'I am not Judas Thomas, but his brother.' Thereupon He made them sit

* The Clementine *Recognitions* say seven (i. 43, ix. 29).

† Von Gutschmid finds that this is the name of a real person, and hence concludes that the story must be more ancient than the Manicheans, who would not have been likely to know this name.

‡ The story of this miracle is three times referred to by St. Augustine: *Cont. Faust.* xxii. 79; *adv. Adimant.* xvii. 2; *De Serm. Dom. in monte* xx.

down, and called on them to remember what His brother had said to them. He taught them all the anxieties, troubles, and temptations which result from the procreation of children, and promised them that if they kept themselves chaste they should partake of the true marriage, and enter the bride-chamber full of light and immortality. The young couple obey this exhortation, much to the grief of the King when he learns their resolution. He orders Thomas to be apprehended, but he had sailed away.

When Thomas arrives in India, he is brought before the King, and being questioned as to his knowledge of masons' or carpenters' work professes great skill in either department. The King asks him if he can build him a palace. He replies that he can, and makes a plan which is approved of. He is then commissioned to build the palace, and is supplied abundantly with money for the work, which, however, he says he cannot begin till the winter months. The King thinks this strange, but being convinced of his skill, acquiesces. But when the King goes away, Thomas, instead of building, employs himself in preaching the Gospel, and spends all the money on the poor. After a time the King sends to know how the work is going on. Thomas sends back word that the palace is finished all but the roof, for which he must have more money; and this is supplied accordingly, and is spent by Thomas on the widows and orphans as before. At length the King returns to the city, and, when he makes inquiry about the palace, he learns that Thomas has never done anything but go about preaching, giving alms to the poor, and healing diseases. He seemed to be a magician, yet he never took money for his cures; lived on bread and water, with salt, and had but one garment. The King, in great anger, sent for Thomas. 'Have you built me my palace?' 'Yes.' 'Let me see it.' 'Oh, you can't see it now, but you will see it when you go out of this world.' Enraged at being thus mocked, the King committed Thomas to prison, until he could devise some terrible form of death for him. But that same night the King's brother died, and his soul was taken up by the angels to see all the heavenly habitations. They asked him in which he would like to dwell. But when

he saw the palace which Thomas had built, he desired to dwell in none but that. When he learned that it belonged to his brother, he begged and obtained that he might return to life in order that he might buy it from him. So as they were putting grave-clothes on the body, it returned to life. He sent for the King, whose love for him he knew, and implored him to sell him the palace. But when the King learned the truth about it, he refused to sell the mansion he hoped to inhabit himself, but consoled his brother with the promise that Thomas, who was still alive, should build him a better one. The two brothers then receive instruction, and are baptized. We learn here some interesting details about the Gnostic rites, and the agreement of the ritual with that described by Cyril of Jerusalem shows that, though most of the words of the prayers put into the Apostle's mouth may be regarded as the invention of the heretical composer of the Acts, much of the ritual, and possibly even some of the words, simply represent the usage of the Church before these Encratites branched off, and which they retained after their separation.

Oil has so prominent a place in this ritual, that it was supposed among the orthodox that the heretics, from whom these Acts emanated, baptized with oil, not with water.* But though in one case no mention is made of water baptism, it may be gathered from the fuller account of other baptisms that it was not omitted. It is, indeed, sometimes difficult to know, when receiving the 'seal' is spoken of, whether the application of oil or of water is intended. Thus, in one place (19, 30, Bonnet's ed.), we have *δέξονται τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ λουτροῦ*, and immediately after (20, 9) *ἵνα διὰ τοῦ ἐλαίου δέξονται τὴν σφραγῖδα*. But the explanation, no doubt, is that the use both of the oil and the water were looked on as essential to the rite; and in the passage referred to an incident is represented as having occurred after the candidates had been sealed, but before they had received *τὸ ἐπισφράγισμα τῆς σφραγῖδος*. The baptismal ceremony commenced with the pouring of oil on the candidate's head by the Apostle, with words of benedic-

* Turibius, *Epist. ad Idacium et Ceponium.*

tion; but throughout he is not represented as confining himself to a definite form of sacramental words, different forms being represented as used on different occasions. In these Acts the forms of prayer, requesting our Lord's presence in the consecrated oil, are much stronger than those with regard to the consecrated bread, *e.g.* (82, 6) *ἐπιδημῆσαι τῷ ἐλαίῳ καταξίωσον τούτῳ εἰς ὃ καὶ τὸ σὸν ἅγιον ἐπιφημίζεται ὄνομα* (compare Cyril. Hier. *Catech.* xxi. 3). After oil had been poured on the head took place the anointing of the candidates: that is, as I suppose, the application of oil with the sign of the cross to different parts of the body. I find no trace that different unguent was used on the two occasions, though this was afterwards the practice. Thus (*Constt. App.* vii. 22), *χρίσεις πρῶτον τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ, ἔπειτα βαπτίσεις ὕδατι, καὶ τελευταῖον σφραγίσεις μύρῳ* (see also Cyril. Hier. xx. 3, and xxi. 3). In these authorities, and in later practice, this anointing comes after the baptism, and not before. In one place in these Acts we have the phrase *ἀλείψας καὶ χρίσας*, where the latter word seems to refer to the pouring of oil on the head, the former to the smearing of the unguent on the body. Cyril's usage is the reverse. Χρίειν is the ordinary O. T. word for the ceremonial anointing of priests, kings, &c. In the case of female candidates, the Apostle himself only pours the oil on the head, but leaves the subsequent anointing to the women.

After the anointing followed the baptism with water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Apparently immersion was used, for the candidates were completely stripped, with the exception of a linen waist-cloth (Cyril, xx. 2). When a fountain could not be had, water was brought in in a trough (*σκάφη*). We may gather from Herodotus, iv. 73, that it would be possible for the candidate to lie down in such a vessel.*

After the baptism those who had been sealed received the Eucharist. In most places the impression is conveyed that no wine was used, and that it consisted of bread and water

* Du Cange in his *Glossary* gives *σκάφη*, with the Romaic diminutive *σκαφιδόπουλο*, as names for a baptismal font.

only. In one place, however, the materials brought in for the feast are κρᾶσιν ὕδατος καὶ ἄρτον ἕνα; and the word κρᾶσις suggests a mixture of wine. After the bread was blessed, the sign of the cross was made on it, and it was distributed with some such words as, 'This be unto thee for the remission of sins;' but, as already stated, there is considerable variety in the words reported to have been used on different occasions. We read more than once of a supernatural voice uttering the 'Amen.' In Justin Martyr's account of the Christian ritual (*Apol.* i. 65) I understand him to describe the people as joining vocally in the earlier prayers, which therefore must have been prescribed forms; but the Eucharistic thanksgiving as uttered by the president alone, and as it would seem, extempore, the people at the end expressing their assent by an Amen. St. Paul plainly refers to this mode of worship (1 Cor. xiv. 16), and its antiquity is proved by its being found in the earliest heretical sects. We learn from an extract preserved by Irenæus (I. x. 1) that in the second century the heretic Marcus uses as an illustration the sound made when all uttered the Amen together.* It need not surprise us therefore to find the Amen here.

But a tale is told showing the danger of receiving unworthily. A youth, who had committed a grievous sin, was 'convicted by the Eucharist,' for on his partaking of the holy food both his hands withered. Being called on to confess, he owned that he had been enamoured of a woman: but having been converted by the Apostle, and having learned from him that he could not have life if he partook of carnal intercourse, he had received the seal, and had endeavoured to prevail on the woman he loved to dwell with him in chastity. But, on her refusing to pledge herself to continence, he thought he had done a good work in slaying her, for he could not bear the thought of her being polluted by another. No difficulty is raised as to the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. The Apostle heals the young man and restores the woman to life, who anticipates Dante in relating

* A couple of centuries later St. Jerome speaks of the thunder of the Christian Amen: 'ad similitudinem cælestis tonitrui Amen reboat' (*Proœm. in Galat.* Lib. 2).

what she had witnessed of the varieties of punishment in the unseen world.

It would be tedious to go through all the stories. Suffice it to say that the appearance of our Lord in the form of Thomas is more than once repeated; and that there are, as in other Gnostic Acts, tales of miracles performed on the brute creation. In a work of this nature we read without surprise that when on a journey the horses are unable to proceed, the wild asses of the desert obeyed the Apostle's summons, and picked out the four strongest of their number to take the place of the exhausted horses; but it exceeds the bounds even of hagiological probability that at the end of his journey Thomas should employ one of the wild asses as his curate, to exorcise a demon and to preach a sermon. One of the tales which moved the contempt of Photius was another story of a speaking ass, who claimed relationship with Balaam's, and with the ass who bore our Lord.*

The journey which I have mentioned results in the martyrdom of Thomas. He converts the wife of the chief minister of the sovereign of the country, who, in obedience to the Apostle's instructions,† refuses further intercourse with her husband. He complains to the King, but the result is that the King's own wife and son become converts to the same doctrine. Thomas has, by his miracles, gained such estimation among the people that the King dares not order his public execution, but by his command the four soldiers who guarded the Apostle pierce him to death with their spears. And this occasions a remark which is worth quoting as exhibiting the docetic denial of the truth that our Lord had a body like ours. Thomas observes that it was fitting that his body, which was made of four elements, should be pierced by four spears, but our Lord's body only by one.

---

* Philaster also (*Hær.* 88) notes it as a characteristic of the Gnostic Acts: 'ut pecudes et canes et bestiæ loquerentur.'

† Of these instructions the following is a specimen:—*οὐκ ὠφελήσει σοι ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ῥυπαρὰ ἡ πρὸς τὸν σὸν ἄνδρα γινομένη· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἀποστερεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς ἀληθινῆς.* The husband, therefore, is guilty of no misrepresentation when he complains, *ὁ πλάνος ἐκεῖνος τοῦτο διδάσκει, ἵνα μή τις γυναικὶ προσομιλήσῃ ἰδίᾳ, ὃ ἡ φύσις ἀπαιτεῖν οἶδεν, καὶ θεὸς ἐνομοθέτησεν, αὐτὸς ἀνατρέπει.*

Notwithstanding the docetic tinge of the passage just quoted, very orthodox language is elsewhere used as to our Lord's twofold nature. He is addressed as Ἰησοῦ ὁ ἐπαναπαυόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας τοῦ καμάτου ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς κύμασι περιπατῶν ὡς θεός. And again, ὁ μονογενὴς ὑπάρχων, ὁ πρωτότοκος πολλῶν ἀδελφῶν, θεὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ καταφρονούμενος ἕως ἄρτι. You will have noticed the use made in this quotation of St. John's Gospel and of the Epistle to the Romans; and in fact these Acts make copious use of the New Testament; of the Gospels, including John, several times, the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, including the Epistle to the Ephesians frequently, and both Epistles to Timothy, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the First Epistles both of St. Peter and St. John, and the Apocalypse.

There is nothing in the facts just stated which forbids us to believe these Acts to have been earlier than the time of Origen. The language used concerning our Lord's twofold nature resembles that employed by Melito;* and all the New Testament books quoted were in full use at the end of the second century. For instance, I see nothing either in the Christology or in the New Testament Canon of these Acts which would make it impossible to believe that they were written by Tatian.† Not that I in the least believe that this writer was capable of inventing the ridiculous stories which these Acts contain; yet we can learn from them what were the notions prevalent among the Encratites to whom Tatian joined himself. And the word Gnostic is one of such very wide application, being given to some whom we should hardly own as Christians at all, that it is interesting to learn how much of Catholic doctrine was held by the Gnostic sects which were nearest to the Church. The Encratites were especially formidable towards the end of the second century,

* Otto's *Apologists*, Fragments vi., xiii., &c.

† A limit to the antiquity of these Acts is placed by the fact that the martyrdom of Thomas was unknown to the Valentinian Heracleon, whose date may be roughly placed at 170. Heracleon, quoted by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iv. 9), arguing against the notion that the only way of confessing Christ was confession before a magistrate, names Matthew, Philip, and Thomas, as never having had occasion to make this kind of confession.

and the controversy with them occupies a whole book of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria.

I should be disposed to conjecture Syria as the place of manufacture of these Acts. I have already noticed their agreement with the 'Doctrine of Addai' in the use of the name of Judas Thomas; and the Acts of Thomas conclude with telling of the removal of the body of Thomas to Edessa.*

I have gone into so much detail about the Acts of Thomas that I can say nothing about those of Andrew, which, in their original form, were probably of equal antiquity; or about the Acts of Philip, a later production of the same school.

IV. *The Acts of St. Peter.*—I have already (see p. 14) told you of the Clementine writings, founded, as it would seem, on an earlier Jewish-Christian work, which related travels of Peter. There is evidently much room for difference of opinion between critics who, guided by internal evidence only, attempt to separate the original portions of a work from subsequent accretions. To me it seems certain that the original 'Circuits of Peter' terminated with the Apostle's arrival at Antioch, beyond which the existing forms of the Clementines do not proceed. Two or three allusions to a subsequent contest of Peter with Simon Magus at Rome I believe to have been inserted when the work was dressed up for Roman circulation. Extant Acts which tell of the contest at Rome are of later date, and of by no means Ebionite character, associating Peter with Paul in joint opposition to the magician. Those who have been trained in the Tübingen theory as to the predominance of the anti-Pauline party in the early Church piously believe that the Acts relating the adventures of Peter at Rome must be an orthodox recasting of anti-Pauline Acts now lost, in which Paul, instead of opposing Simon, was himself to be recognized under that name. But of the existence of such Acts there is not a particle of evidence, nor do I know of any passages in the extant Acts which suggest that they originally bore an anti-Pauline aspect. Non-

* Rufinus tells (*H. E.* ii. 5), that Edessa claimed to possess the body of St. Thomas.

Ebionite Acts of Peter are as old as the second century, for we learn from a quotation by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 5) that the '*Preaching of Peter*' was of this character.*

In truth, I consider that the first condition for either tracing rightly the genesis of the Petrine legends, or understanding the history of the early Church, is the rejection of the speculations which Baur has built on the fact that in the Clementine Homilies Paul is assailed under the mask of Simon Magus. The consequence has been that his disciples cannot hear Simon Magus named without thinking of Paul. By a false historical perspective they project the image of third-century heretics back upon the first ages of the Church; and the climax is reached by Volkmar, who makes the Simon-Paul myth antecedent to Luke, and finds in Acts viii. a covert assault upon the Apostle of the Gentiles.† I have already had occasion to mention (p. 19) that it is only in the Homilies, which exhibit the latest form of the Elkesaite legends, that the assault on Paul under the character of Simon is to be found. The Clementine *Recognitions*, which contain an earlier form of the same story, are also decidedly anti-Pauline. Paul figures in them as the 'enemy,' and as persecuting the Church; but as the date of the incident is before his journey to Damascus, there is nothing in the story that might not be accepted by a reader fully persuaded of the truth of Luke's

* This book of the preaching of Peter is of very early date. It is several times quoted by Clement, and was also used by Heracleon (Origen in *Joan.* tom. XIII. 17). The work was not Ebionite, for it condemned equally both false methods of worshipping God: κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας and κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους (Clem. Alex. *ubi supra*). It is now generally acknowledged (see Grabe, *Spicil.* I. 66, Fabricius, *Cod., Ap. N. T.* vol. I. 800) that the book contained discourses of Paul, as well as of Peter, and that it is the same work as that called by pseudo-Cyprian (*De Rebaptismate*, 17) the *Preaching of Paul*, a book which represented the two Apostles as joined together on friendly terms at Rome. Lactantius says (*Inst. Div.* IV. 21), 'quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt; et ea prædicatio in memoriam scripta permansit.' It seems to me likely that this work was known to Justin Martyr, who twice (*Apol.* I. 20, 44) quotes the prophecies of the Sibyl and of Hystaspes as to the destruction of the world by fire. Now, Hystaspes and the Sibyl were thus coupled in a discourse ascribed to Paul cited by Clement (*Strom.* VI. 5) in connexion with the *Preaching of Peter*, and by Lactantius (*Inst. Div.* VII. 15, 18).

† Hilgenfeld has lately written his recantation of this theory (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 164), and now owns the historical character of Simon.

narrative. The writer shows his hostility to Paul only by making no mention of his subsequent conversion or his preaching to the Gentiles. And none of the language which, in the *Recognitions*, is put into the mouth of Simon conveys any reference to Paul. Indeed, the whole story of Simon, which is found in both forms of the Clementines, attributes to him characteristics with which Paul has nothing in common. The magician is a Samaritan, he had been a disciple of John the Baptist, he has a concubine named Helena, he works miracles in no way resembling those ascribed to Paul, and he arrogates to himself divine prerogatives.

It is plain that the use of a historical name as a nickname implies some previous knowledge of the character whose name is so employed. Whence, then, are we to suppose that the Clementine writers obtained their knowledge of Simon? I answer: in the first instance from the Acts of the Apostles; for never, do I think, was there a more complete ὕστερον πρότερον than when the Clementines were used to explain the genesis of the Book of the Acts. The *Recognitions* in several places betray a use of the Acts. They mention, for instance, Paul's journey to Damascus; they know that Gamaliel took the Apostle's part, telling the story in the curious form, that Gamaliel was in truth a Christian, but had obtained from the Apostles a dispensation to conceal his faith.* From the Acts, then, I believe, that the Clementine writer drew his knowledge of Simon as a Samaritan, as a magician, and, it is important to add, as one who had been a disciple of Jesus.

As for the particulars which the Clementines add to what is told of Simon in the Acts, I feel no doubt that they were derived from Justin Martyr. Justin himself states in his *Apology* that he was also the author of a work on heresies; and the best authorities are agreed that this lost work of Justin's formed the basis of the treatise on heresy by Irenæus

* The 'Doctrine of Addai' I count to be later than the Clementine *Recognitions*, and to be indebted to them for some particulars. For instance, it represents Christ as lodging in the house of Gamaliel, and (p. 16) the Apostles as bound to send to James periodically accounts of their mission.

and Hippolytus. When we find the first two places in the list of heretics assigned to the two Samaritan heretics, Simon and Menander, we infer that the information was furnished by the Samaritan Justin, who duly records the villages where each was born; and the coincidences between the account of Simon given by Irenæus (i. 21) and in the Clementines, lead us to believe that Justin was the source of the latter as well as of the former. If the whole Clementine story of Simon be later than Justin Martyr, we evidently can attribute no great antiquity to the identification of the Clementine Simon with Paul, which must be later still.*

The Acts of Peter and Paul, as printed by Tischendorf, are much later than the Clementines. Simon appears in the character of a magician, and performs many wonders in his conflict with the Apostles before Nero. Thus he offers to allow his head to be cut off, undertaking in three days to rise again. But by his magical power he deceives the eyes of the spectators; and it is a ram which is made to assume his form and is beheaded. So, to the Emperor's amazement, Simon walks in at the appointed time, complaining, What a mess you have got here! Why they have never wiped up the blood where they cut off my head. Finally Simon exhibits his power by undertaking to fly up to heaven from the top of a lofty tower. But on the Apostles' adjuration, the evil angels who are bearing him are compelled to drop him, and he is taken up dead. Yet the Emperor, instead of being convinced, orders the execution of the two Apostles. But I may mention, as showing the affinity of these Acts to those previously described, that the cause of hostility to the Apostles is stated to be the number of matrons whom they had persuaded to leave the society of their husbands, among whom were the wife of the Emperor's chief minister, Agrippa, and Nero's own wife, Livia. You will notice how the framer of the story has mixed up the personages of the reigns of

* In my article SIMON MAGUS, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, I give my reasons for thinking that there really was a Samaritan heretical teacher of the not uncommon name of Simon, but that Justin was mistaken in identifying him with the Simon of the Acts, and, under this mistake, imagining him to be the founder of Gnosticism.

Augustus and of Nero. There were Gnostic Acts, which I regard as earlier than those from which I quote, and which contain other stories of Simon's conflict with the Apostles, and legends of the Apostles' work at Rome, which it would be tedious to detail. But perhaps I ought not to pass by in silence the celebrated story of 'Domine quo vadis?' Peter had, by the advice of the leading members of the Church, resolved on withdrawing from the coming persecution; but outside the city he meets the Lord coming in; and on asking Him whither He is going, is answered, To Rome, to be again crucified. Thereupon Peter, understanding the rebuke, returns to fulfil the Lord's command.

I have said that the Acts, as published by Tischendorf, are not very ancient. I will mention two proofs of this. One is that Hippolytus, who wrote about A.D. 235, is ignorant of the version of the death of Simon, which I have repeated to you, and which eventually became the most widely received. The story told by Hippolytus is, that Simon commanded himself to be buried, promising to rise again in three days. And buried he was; but buried he remained. The other proof is drawn from the fact that in these Acts the martyrdom of the two Apostles is made to take place on the 29th June, the day on which it has been commemorated for centuries; for it came to be held that Peter and Paul, though not martyred in the same year, suffered on the same day.*

We find that about the middle of the second century the custom had begun of making a commemoration of a martyrdom on the first anniversary of its occurrence, and about the middle of the third century of making, at least in the case of very distinguished martyrs, commemorations on successive anniversaries. For these purposes it was necessary to preserve the memory of the exact day of the martyrdom. But I find no evidence that either custom was earlier than the date I have named; and I do not believe that in the hurry and panic of the Neronian persecutions any record was preserved of the dates of the martyrdoms. But the 29th June does commemorate a real occurrence, namely, a translation of

* Prudentius, *Peristeph.* 12.

the bodies of the two Apostles, which an authentic Kalendar of the Roman Church* records as having taken place on that day in the year 258. The earliest mention of the commemoration of the two Apostles is by Caius, of whom I have already spoken (p. 51), and dates from the beginning of the third century. Apparently the Montanist antagonist of Caius, in claiming authority for the Asiatic Churches, had cited the great names of their founders, or former rulers. Caius (*ap.* Euseb. ii. 25) retorts by appealing to the authority of the founders of the Roman Church—Peter and Paul—whose 'trophies' might be seen, the one on the Vatican, the other on the Ostian Way. These were the places where early tradition, which I see no reason to reject, related that the Apostles respectively suffered. They were probably buried, each near the place of his martyrdom; and there, in process of time, tombs were erected, which became centres of Christian worship. But the year 258 witnessed a terrible persecution under the Emperor Valerian, in the course of which the bishops Sixtus perished at Rome and Cyprian at Carthage. The Christians were forbidden to hold meetings or to enter their places of sepulture. Then a hiding-place was found in the Catacombs, to which, on 29th June, the two bodies were transferred, and there meetings could secretly be held. The deposition of the bodies became a subject of annual commemoration; and it is this, and not the martyrdom, which, as I believe, the 29th June really commemorates. A document, therefore, which describes the Apostles as suffering on that day, is pretty sure to be considerably later than the year 258.†

* See Mommsen's memoir on the Chronographer of the year 354, *Abhandlungen der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft*, i. 585.

† I am indebted for this account of what took place in 258 to Duchesne (*Liber Pontificalis*, p. civ.). In comparatively modern times a theory was put forward that Peter's martyrdom took place, not on the Vatican, but on the slope of the Janiculum, and in the year 1500 a church (S. Pietro in Montorio) was built to consecrate this supposed site. But Aringhi (*Roma Sotterranea*, II. 5) has given what appear to be conclusive reasons for holding fast to the old tradition, that the martyrdom took place not far from the place on the Vatican where from early times it was believed Peter's body was laid. Tradition preserved the fact that the Apostles' bodies were removed from the original place of deposition to the Catacombs; but the true explanation of the removal being lost, legend busied itself in

Before quitting the subject of the Petrine Acts, I ought to mention that Lipsius holds that the tradition of Peter's preaching and martyrdom at Rome is confronted by a rival tradition, which makes the scene of his activity Pontus and the East. But my opinion is that the latter tradition was intended not to contradict but to supplement the earlier story, which told of Peter's work at Rome. I have already quoted a passage from Origen, which represents Peter as having first laboured in those countries which are named in the salutation with which his First Epistle begins. The Gnostic Acts of Andrew appear to have made that Apostle take part with his brother in joint work in Pontus. A history is given of the successful labours of Andrew among the savage and cannibal tribes which were believed to inhabit the shores of the Black Sea. The legend which made Andrew labour in that part of the world afterwards proved convenient. For when, through the favour of Constantine, Byzantium was made to rank above cities in which Apostles were known to have laboured, an attempt was made to supply the deficiency of the new capital in ecclesiastical associations by a claim that its first bishop had been appointed by St. Andrew, whose body it soon took pains to possess. No legend represented Peter as sharing his brother's fate; and we have every reason to think that the same Acts which told of Peter's work in the East told also of his return to other labours in the West.

V. *The Acts of St. John.**—Of all the Gnostic Acts, those which related the work of John seem to me to have left the greatest traces on Church tradition; and I am inclined to think that it is with the Acts of John that the name of Leucius ought specially to be connected; for he seems to have been represented as an attendant on that Apostle.

---

inventing another. Pope Gregory the Great (*Ep.* iv. 30) tells a story more obscurely told in verses of Pope Damasus (De Rossi, *Inscr. Christ.*, ii. 32; see also *Acta Pet. et Pauli*, *ap.* Tischendorf, *Acta Apoc.* p. 38), that certain Greeks attempted to steal the bodies, but were compelled by a miraculous thunderstorm and earthquake to drop them near the place where they were temporarily deposited in the Catacombs. How long they remained there is uncertain, but it is probable that it was on Constantine's accession they were restored to their ancient resting-places.

* Some additions were made to the previously edited remains of these Acts, in *Acta Johannis*, published by Zahn, 1880.

Several traditions concerning John, which are mentioned by very early writers, agree so closely with what we know to have been told in the Gnostic Acts as to favour the idea that these Acts may have been the original source of these traditions. But this account cannot be given of all the stories told about this Apostle. For instance, the beautiful story of John and the robber, which I do not repeat, because it has been told so often that most of you are likely to know it already, appears to have been derived by Clement of Alexandria (*Quis div. salv.* 42) from some different source. For later Christian writers, who show independent knowledge of other things contained in the Leucian Acts, appear to have known for this story no other authority than Clement.

The Leucian Acts came under discussion at the second Council of Nicæa. They had been appealed to by the Iconoclasts; for one of their stories was, that the Apostle John rebuked a disciple for the cult he found him to be in the habit of paying to a certain picture; on which he was informed that the picture was his own. John, who had never seen his own face, refused to own the likeness, until a mirror was brought him; when he was convinced, but still said that his disciple had done ill. In order to discredit this authority, passages from these Acts were read at the Council to exhibit their heretical character. The docetism of the Acts comes out very plainly from this evidence. John is related as informing his disciples that when he tried to lay hold on our Lord it had sometimes happened to him to find solid substance, but not so at other times; that, though he could see Him walking, he was never able to see that He left any footprint on the ground; and that when our Lord was invited to a feast He used to divide the loaf that was given Him among His disciples, who found the portion thus handed them so satisfying, that they needed not to touch the loaves given by the host to themselves. Our Lord is related to have appeared to His disciples sometimes young, sometimes old; sometimes small, sometimes so high as to touch the heavens with His head. And there is a story how John, not bearing to witness the Crucifixion, fled to the Mount of Olives; and there, while the mob believed they were crucifying our Lord, He conversed

with John and showed him a wonderful vision of a cross of light, which I must not attempt to describe, for I should wander away too far if I were to try to explain how some leading Gnostic sects contrived, notwithstanding their docetism, to rival the orthodox in the honour they paid to the Cross.

Now, one of the reasons for thinking it possible that these Acts may be as old as Clement of Alexandria is, that that father states that he read 'in the traditions,' that when John handled the body of our Lord it offered no resistance, but yielded place to the Apostle's hand.

The Encratite character of these Acts is very strongly marked. For example, one of the Apostle's miracles is performed on a lady who had submitted to die rather than associate with her husband. And we have also the favourite Gnostic type of miracle, the conferring intelligence on the brute creation. It may amuse you to hear, by way of example, what the narrator describes as a pleasant incident. On their journey the party stopped at an uninhabited caravanserai. They found there but one bare couch, and having laid clothes on it they made the Apostle lie on it, while the rest of the party laid themselves down to sleep on the floor. But John was troubled by a great multitude of bugs, until after having tossed sleepless for half the night he said to them, in the hearing of all: 'I say unto you, O ye bugs, be ye kindly considerate; leave your home for this night, and go to rest in a place which is far from the servants of God.' At this the disciples laughed, while the Apostle turned to sleep, and they conversed gently, so as not to disturb him. In the morning the first to awake went to the door, and there they saw a great multitude of bugs standing. The rest collected to view, and at last St. John awoke and saw likewise. Then (mindful rather of his grateful obligation to the bugs than of the comfort of the next succeeding traveller) he said: 'O ye bugs, since ye have been kind and have observed my charge, return to your place.' No sooner had he said this and risen from the couch, than the bugs all in a run (δρομαῖοι) rushed from the door to the couch, climbed up the legs, and disappeared into the joinings. And John said: 'See how these creatures,

having heard the voice of a man, have obeyed; but we, hearing the voice of God, neglect and disobey; and how long?' (Zahn, p. 226.)

I will now mention some of the statements which were contained in the Leucian Acts, and which were known in the Church so early that, if we could believe it was from these Acts the knowledge was obtained, we might assign them very high antiquity:—

(1) These Acts tell (Zahn, p. 247) how John's virginity had been preserved by a threefold interposition of our Lord, breaking off the Apostle's designs each time that he attempted to marry. In conformity with their Encratism, these Acts dwelt much on the Apostle's virginity, describing this as the cause of our Lord's love to him, and as the reason for his many privileges; in particular, as the reason why to a virgin the care of the Virgin Mother was committed. In a third-century Gnostic work, *Pistis Sophia*, the name of the Apostle John ordinarily has the title ὁ παρθένος appended. Now the opinion of John's virginity, concerning which the canonical Scriptures say nothing, is common to many of the fathers. It is as early as Tertullian (*De Monog.* 17). We are not entitled to say positively that this opinion must have been derived from the Acts of which I am speaking, because a true tradition that John never married might easily have been preserved in the Churches of Asia Minor; yet, when this is taken in connexion with other coincidences, it gives some probability to the view that Acts of John existed as early as the second century, and were the source whence subsequent writers drew their traditions.

(2) The story told in the Muratorian Fragment (see p. 54) of John's composition of his Gospel having originated from a request of the bishops of Asia has great affinity with what Clement of Alexandria tells (*Euseb.* vi. 14), that John, having seen that the bodily things had been related in the previous Gospels, made a spiritual Gospel προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, Πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα. It is not conceivable that one of these writers copied from the other; but several later writers (as, for instance, Jerome in the preface to his Commentary on St. Matthew) tell the same story, agreeing, however, in some

additional particulars, which show that they did not derive their knowledge from either of the authors whom I have named. Thus they tell that the request that John should write was caused by the inroads of the Ebionite heresy, which made it necessary that the Apostle should add something concerning the Divinity of our Lord to what his predecessors had said about His humanity; and they tell how, in answer to their prayers, the Apostle, filled with the Holy Ghost, burst into the prologue, 'In the beginning was the Word' (see note, p. 54). Other coincidences make it likely that this story was found in Acts of John used by Clement.

(3) Tertullian (*Præscrip.* 36) refers to the story of John having been cast into burning oil, and taken out unhurt. Jerome, who tells the same story in his Commentary on Matthew, xx. 23, there speaks of the Apostle as an athlete, the peculiar applicability of which term is not obvious, but receives its explanation from Acts which are known to have been derived from those of Leucius, where John is said to have come out of the oil, 'not burned, but anointed like an athlete.' Hence it is concluded that Jerome, who is otherwise known to have used the Leucian Acts, found in them this story; and then arises the question whether these Acts may not have been early enough for Tertullian to have used them too. On the other hand, it must be mentioned that Origen, when commenting on our Lord's words to the sons of Zebedee, and reconciling them with the fact that John did not suffer martyrdom, makes no mention of the story of the baptism in oil. A later story makes John miraculously drink a cup of poison with impunity.*

On the whole, we have clear evidence that Acts or traditions about John were in circulation before the time of Clement and Tertullian. When we combine the docetic character of the traditions which reached Clement with the fact that the Acts of Thecla, a work known to Tertullian, had

* This miracle is very rare in ancient hagiology. The only other case I remember is that Papias tells that Justus Barsabas drank poison, and, through the Lord's grace, received no hurt (see p. 318). I cannot but think that Papias told the story in illustration of Mark xvi. 18.

clearly an Encratite stamp, it seems to me highly probable that these second century Acts of John had the same character, and that they were either those afterwards known under the name of Leucius, or, at least, that they contained the materials on which the Leucian writer worked.*

It would be wearisome if I were to discuss all the legends about John. It will be enough if I mention that Leucius concludes by relating the Apostle's painless death. He gives what purports to be John's sermon and Eucharistic prayer on the last Sunday of his life. Then, after breaking of bread—there is no mention of wine—he commands Byrrhus (the name occurs in the Ignatian epistles as that of an Ephesian deacon) to follow him with two companions, bringing spades with them. They go to a friend's burying-place outside the city, and there dig a grave, in which the Apostle lays himself down, and with joyful prayer blesses his disciples, and resigns his soul to God.† Later versions improve the miraculous character of the story: in particular that of which Augustine makes mention (*In Johann.* xxi., *Tractat.* 124); that the Apostle lay in the grave not dead but sleeping, as might be seen by the motions of the dust over his grave, which played as if stirred by the Apostle's breathing.‡ Zahn has con-

---

* Zahn dates the Leucian Acts of John as early as 130; Lipsius places them about 160; I am myself inclined to date them 10 or 20 years later.

† This story is accepted as true by Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxxix. 5).

‡ The form in which the Gnostic stories about John were circulated among the orthodox is illustrated by a very ancient prologue to St. John's Gospel, found, with slight variations, in many MSS., in particular the Codex Aureus and the Codex Amiatinus. It runs as follows:—Johannes Evangelista unus ex discipulis domini, qui virgo electus a domino est, quem de nuptiis volentem nubere revocavit dominus, cujus virginitatis in hoc duplex testimonium in Evangelio datur, quod et præ ceteris dilectus domini dicitur, et huic matrem suam de cruce commendavit ut virginem virgo servaret. Denique manifestans in evangelio quod erat ipse incorruptibilis, [incorruptibilis] verbi opus inchoans solus, verbum carnem factum esse, nec lumen a tenebris fuisse comprehensum testatur, primus signum ponens quod in nuptiis fecit dominus, ut ostendens quod erat ipse legentibus demonstaret, quod ubi dominus invitatur, deficere nuptiarum vinum debeat, ut veteribus immutatis nova omnia quæ a Christo instituuntur appareant. Hic evangelium scripsit in Asia postea quam in Pathmos insula apocalypsin scripserat, ut cui in principio canonis incorruptibile principium in genesi et incorruptibilis finis per virginem in apocalypsi redderetur, dicente Christo, ego sum A et Ω. Et hic est Johannes, qui sciens supervenisse diem recessus sui convocatis discipulis suis in Epheso per multa signorum experimenta promens

jectured that the story of two tombs of John at Ephesus may have arisen from the traditional veneration paid to two spots sacred to the memory of John: one the place within the city where he had been wont to preach; the other the place outside the city where he was buried.

But I must not conclude this account of legends of the Apostolic age without saying something about one of them, which, though one of the latest in birth, has been the most fortunate in its reception—I mean the story of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. It is, as you know, received as true in the Roman Catholic section of the Church. Some indeed have held (see Tillemont, i. 476) that the word means no more than the name Κοίμησις, under which the same feast is kept in the Greek Church; and the prayers appointed for the feast in the Roman Church make no distinct mention of a corporal assumption. But this is certainly in that Church a matter almost universally believed. And before the meeting of the Vatican Council, those entitled to speak with authority declared that at that Council the wish of Pius IX. would be carried out, and the fact of the Assumption erected into an article of faith, to deny which would forfeit salvation. The dispersion of the Council disappointed these anticipations, at least for the time. It were much to be desired that the story, if true, should receive some such infallible attestation, because on the ordinary grounds of historical evidence its pretensions are of the slenderest. Not that it had not wide extent of circulation, for it is handed down in Greek, Latin, Syriac,* Arabic, Ethiopic, and Sahidic. But none of the existing forms is earlier than the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth century; and the absence of any early

---

Christum, descendens in defossum sepulturæ suæ locum facta oratione positus est ad patres suos, tam extraneus a dolore mortis quam a corruptione carnis invenitur alienus. Tamen post omnes evangelium scripsit et hoc virgini debebatur. Quorum tamen vel scripturarum tempore dispositio vel librorum ordinatio ideo per singula a nobis non exponitur, ut sciendi desiderio collocato et quærentibus fructus laboris et domino magisterii doctrina servetur.

* The Greek and Latin versions are included in Tischendorf's *Apocalypses apocryphæ;* and Syriac versions have been published by Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature, N. T.*, and *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1865.

authoritative version of the story is evidenced by the great variety with which it is told, which is such as to embarrass me a little in what form I shall present it to you. According to the oldest authorities, the time is the second year after the Ascension, though later authorities give the Virgin a score more years of life. The Virgin prays the Lord for her release, and for the protection of her body and soul from earthly and spiritual enemies. Then the angel Gabriel is sent to her to announce her departure in three days, and gives her a palm-branch as a token. At her request the Apostles are all brought to Bethlehem to witness her departure, each being miraculously wafted on clouds from the quarter of the world whither he had gone—John from Ephesus, Peter from Rome, Thomas from India, &c. Three or four of the Apostles who had already died are raised to life and brought like the rest; the angel who summons them warning them that they are not to suppose the general resurrection has yet come, as they are only brought to life in order to take part in the obsequies of the Virgin. By the fifth century the belief was entertained in Ephesus that the mother of our Lord had accompanied St. John to Ephesus; but the earlier story makes her die at Jerusalem. For the Jews having made an attack on the house at Bethlehem, which had become notorious by the multitude of the miracles wrought there, the Apostles smite the assailants with blindness, and transport the couch to Jerusalem. Then on the third day the Lord descends from heaven with His angels, and takes to Himself the Virgin's soul. But the Jews are resolved to burn her body with fire; and this they would do, but that they are smitten with blindness; and so wander fruitlessly, while the Apostles bear her body to the Valley of Jehoshaphat, to bury her in a new tomb prepared by Joseph of Arimathea. Peter on the right hand bears the bier; but the honour of carrying the palm-branch before her is yielded to the virgin John. One of the chiefs of the Jews having laid hold of the bier, an angel with a fiery sword cuts off his hands; but, on his repentance and conversion, the hands are, by the Apostles' intercession, joined on to his body again. Then, according to one account, the angels are heard for two days singing at the tomb; but on the third day

the songs cease, and so the Apostles know that the body has been transferred to Paradise. According to another account, Thomas had not been with the Apostles when they took leave of the Virgin; but he sees her body being taken up to heaven, and at his prayer she drops him her girdle as a token. When he afterwards joins the other Apostles, and declares that she is not in the tomb, they suppose that it is only his habitual incredulity which makes him doubt their word that they had placed her there; but he shows the girdle, and on opening the tomb they find the body is not there.

The Greek version of this story, published by Tischendorf, in which the story purports to be told by the Apostle John, has all the marks of lateness, and is clearly not earlier than the fifth century. The Latin version bears a somewhat earlier aspect. Melito of Sardis, who, with some little disregard of chronology, is made a disciple of the Apostle John, is the narrator; and a preface states that his object is to give an authentic account of what Leucius had related with heretical additions. This suggests that the existing versions may possibly be an orthodox recasting of an earlier Gnostic story; and Lipsius holds that this is the case, but as it seems to me on no sufficient grounds, for I can find no evidence that the story had currency, even in heretical circles, so early as the third century.

I have detained you a long time in the region of the fabulous, but the time is not altogether wasted that is spent on a study which gives one a keener sense of the difference between the legendary and the historical; and I never feel so strongly that the book of the Acts of the Apostles is a record of real history, as when I take it up after having laid down the not very cunningly devised fables in which men have exhibited the sort of Apostolic Acts pure invention would furnish us with.

XX.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

IT is a satisfaction to me to escape from the quaking sands of apocryphal legends, and step on the firm ground of the Pauline Epistles. Of these there are four which, as you know, Baur does not question; and later critics, who have no bigoted attachment to received opinion, find themselves obliged to make further acknowledgments. Hilgenfeld and Davidson agree in owning 1 Thessalonians, Philemon, and Philippians: Renan positively rejects none but the Pastoral Epistles, but has doubts besides concerning the Epistle to the Ephesians. But Baur is far from marking the lowest point of negative criticism. He found disciples who bettered his instruction, until it became as hard for a young Professor, anxious to gain a reputation for ingenuity, to make a new assault on a New Testament book, as it is now for an Alpine club man to find in Switzerland a virgin peak to climb. The consequence has been that in Holland, Scholten and others, who had been counted as leaders in the school of destructive criticism, have been obliged to come out in the character of Conservatives, striving to prove, in opposition to Loman, that there really did live such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, and that it is not true that every one of the Epistles ascribed to Paul is a forgery. And certainly it is not only to the orthodox that the doctrine that we have no genuine remains of Paul is inconvenient; it must also embarrass those who look for arguments to prove an Epistle to be un-Pauline. I leave these last to fight the battle with their more advanced brethren. I have constantly felt some hesitation in deciding

what objections it was worth while to report to you. On the one hand, it is waste of energy to try to kill what, if let alone, will be sure to die of itself: on the other hand, there is the danger that you might afterwards find notions, which I had passed by as too contemptible for refutation, circulating among half-learned people as the 'latest results' which 'eminent critics' had arrived at in Germany. But in the present case, I think I am safe in deciding that it is practically unnecessary for me to trouble myself about the opinions of those who carry their scepticism to a further point than Baur.

Let me say this, however, that I think young critics have been seduced into false tracks by the reputation which has been wrongly gained by the display of ingenuity in finding some new reason for doubting received opinions. A man is just as bad a critic who rejects what is genuine, as who accepts what is spurious. 'Be ye good money-changers' is a maxim which I have already told you (p. 18) was early applied to this subject. But if a bank clerk would be unfit for his work who allowed himself easily to be imposed on by forged paper, he would be equally useless to his employers if he habitually pronounced every note that was tendered him to be a forgery, every sovereign to be base metal. I quite disbelieve that the early Christian Church was so taken possession of by forgers that almost all its genuine remains were corrupted or lost, while the spurious formed the great bulk of what was thought worth preserving. The suspicions that have been expressed seem to me to pass the bounds of literary sanity. There are rogues in this world, and you do well to guard against them; but if you allow your mind to be poisoned by suspicion, and take every man for a rogue, why, the rogues will conspire against you, and lock you up in a lunatic asylum.

In this lecture I must confine myself to discussing the genuineness of Epistles, and I am glad that I can assume your acquaintance with Paley's admirable *Horæ Paulinæ*. How very wide a field the general subject of the life and work of Paul would present, if I attempted to enter it, is evidenced by the mass of literature which of late years has been

occupied with it. A beginning was made by Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul; since then we have had works on St. Paul by Mr. Lewin and by Archdeacon Farrar, each in two large volumes. Renan, approaching the subject from another point of view, expressly devotes one volume to St. Paul, and finds himself obliged to give also to that Apostle's work a considerable portion both of the previous and of the subsequent volumes of his history. Then there are very interesting small volumes published by the Christian Knowledge Society on separate parts of the Apostle's labours—'St. Paul in Greece,' 'St. Paul in Asia,' &c. Much additional information is to be found in the Introductions to the Epistles in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and in Bishop Ellicott's. But chief among recent aids to knowledge of St. Paul may be reckoned Bishop Lightfoot's three volumes of *Commentaries*—a work, the discontinuance of which we have seen with regret, perhaps not quite selfish. For it may be doubted whether the gain which the present generation in England receives from his episcopal labours compensates the loss which the Church at large has suffered in the interruption of the production of work which would have been of permanent value. Postponing the consideration of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I deal now with the letters which bear Paul's name. These divide themselves into four groups, separated by intervals of time of somewhere about five years: (1) the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, (2) the four acknowledged by Baur, (3) the Epistles written during the Roman imprisonment, (4) the Pastoral Epistles.

With regard to the Pauline Epistles generally, it may be remarked that the very early and general recognition which they obtained throws fatal obstacles in the way of the theory that the party which rejected Paul's apostleship had any very long or wide possession of the Church. It is with reserve that I can appeal to Peter's Second Epistle in proof of the authority of the Pauline letters, because the genuineness of that Epistle is denied; but, whether written by Peter or not, it is unquestionably an early document; and it is clear that at the time of its composition, a collection of Pauline letters

had been made and was regarded as of high authority.* There is abundant other evidence at what a very early period the Pauline letters passed from being the special property of the Churches to which they were severally addressed, and were formed into a collection for the use of the Church at large. This was unquestionably the case at the end of the second century, when first Christian literature becomes abundant; for we find Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian, not only owning the authority of the thirteen Pauline Epistles, but apparently unconscious that there could be two opinions on the subject. We have in the Muratorian Canon (see p. 49) the order in which the Epistles stood towards the end of the second century in the collection in use in the Church of Rome. Going back to the first half of the second century we find that Marcion used a collection of ten Pauline letters, which formed his *Apostolicon*, these being the same as the thirteen recognized in the Western Church, with the exception of the three Pastoral Epistles. Marcion is notorious for his exaggerated Paulinism; but though more than one answer to him is extant, there is no indication that any of his orthodox opponents met him by questioning that Apostle's authority, reverence for which was common to both parties. But we may be sure that the orthodox did not learn that reverence from Marcion, and that it was not his example which set the Catholic Church on forming a collection of Pauline letters. We are, therefore, safe in inferring that such a collection must have been formed before Marcion's time. It is now universally acknowledged that the Church's Gospel was not formed by enlargement of Marcion's Gospel, but, on the contrary, Marcion's by mutilation of the Church's Gospel; so we may reasonably conclude that the Church's collection of thirteen letters is more ancient than Marcion's collection of only ten.

It is natural to think that it was the existence of a collection of Pauline letters which set the example of making other

* It is by no means clear to what particular passage in Paul's letters reference is made in 2 Pet. iii. 15; but I cannot agree with Zahn, to whom in this section I am much indebted (*N. T. Canon*, pp. 811–839), in the improbable explanation that the collection of Pauline letters, known to 2 Peter, included one not embraced in the collection which has come down to us.

collections of Christian letters. Thus we learn from Euseb. iv. 23, not only that there was extant a collection of the letters of Dionysius of Corinth, including even some addressed to individuals, but further, that in the lifetime of Dionysius himself, his letters had thus passed into general circulation; for he complains of corruptions made in the text of his letters by emissaries of the devil. It is more important to remark that Polycarp's epistle reveals that before tidings of the martyrdom of Ignatius had yet reached the East, a collection of Ignatius's letters had already begun to be formed, one Church writing to another to request copies of the letters in its possession. The probable inference that the Churches which set about making a collection of Ignatian letters were already in possession of Pauline letters, is put beyond doubt by the contents of Polycarp's epistle. It is not merely that Polycarp is evidently in possession of a large collection of Pauline letters —for he makes undoubted use of the Epistle to the Romans, of both to the Corinthians, of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, both Thessalonians, and both to Timothy—but he assumes also acquaintance on the part of his readers with the Pauline letters; not only his letters to their own Church, of which he makes express mention, but also those to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians. New Testament quotations are much more rare in the epistles of Ignatius than in that of Polycarp; but there is express mention of the Pauline letters, and besides a very large number of coincidences of expressions with these letters, a few unmistakeable quotations, in particular from the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians. Remembering, then, that Ignatius died in the reign of Trajan, and that Polycarp quotes the Epistles to Timothy, we are justified in inferring that the collection of thirteen Pauline letters was in general Church use before A.D. 113. Going back, then, to the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, we know for certain that at least one letter, addressed to a different Church, had found its way to Rome, namely, that to the Corinthians themselves, to which an express appeal is made. Finding thus that, at the date of Clement's letter, Pauline letters had passed out of the keeping of the particular Church to which they were addressed, we are

justified in inferring, from several coincidences of language, Clement's acquaintance with other Pauline letters; and it is to be noted that those coincidences are most distinct in the case of one of the most questioned of Paul's epistles—that to the Ephesians, and quite sufficiently distinct in the case of others —those to Timothy. Since we know, then, for certain, that in the year 95 the letter to their own Church was not the only Pauline letter in the possession of the Church of Rome, it becomes highly probable that they had in use the whole collection of thirteen letters which we find in general use less than twenty years later, and many traces of the use of which are to be found in Clement's letter. If we ask, then, at what period the collection was made, nothing seems to me more probable than that it was when the news of Paul's death became public that different Churches set themselves to collect and compare the letters of his which they possessed. And though Zahn's reasons come much short of demonstration, his conjecture is probable enough, that the collection was first made at Corinth, the epistles to which Church occupy the first place in the Muratorian list.

Returning now to what has been said (p. 347), we see what an early date St. Luke's non-acquaintance with Pauline letters obliges us to put on the book of the Acts. But it is the less necessary to insist on this point, since both Clement and Polycarp, whose testimony we have used to the existence of a collection of Pauline letters, likewise make distinct use of the Acts.

It is quite unnecessary to produce other second-century testimony to the authority of the Pauline letters; and if, therefore, I think it worth while to give a proof of the reverence in which Paul's authority was held in the time of Justin Martyr, it is not that there is any real necessity for showing that that father was no dissentient from the general opinion of the Church, but because the piece of evidence seems to me interesting in itself, and has only recently been brought clearly to light.* Only two

* I am indebted for my knowledge of it to a paper by Zahn (*Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte*, viii. 1., Dec. 1885).

works of Justin have come down to us with tolerable completeness, and are universally recognized as genuine, the *Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*. The subject of the one being the controversy with heathenism, and the other that with Judaism, both works were intended to influence readers external to the Church; and, accordingly, although in countless passages Justin's use of the New Testament writings is evident to one already acquainted with them, he never formally quotes any of them except (as already mentioned, p. 224) in one case, the Apocalypse. These two works, however, offer abundant evidence of Justin's acquaintance with the writings of St. Paul, whose ideas, and even whose language, he repeatedly reproduces. Proofs will be found in Westcott's *N. T. Canon*, p. 168, and also in a paper by Thoma in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, which I have already had occasion to quote for another purpose (p. 72). Indeed, as Justin tells us that he wrote a treatise in answer to Marcion, he could not possibly have engaged in that controversy without a knowledge of the Pauline writings. Thoma, however, imagines that the fact that Justin does not quote Paul by name implies that he did not attribute to him Apostolic authority. But this inference is inconsistent with the influence that Paul's writings evidently exercised over Justin's thoughts; and is certainly not justified when we remember that it is not Justin's habit to quote any Christian writer by name, seeing that he wrote for persons who recognized Apostolic authority neither in Paul nor in anyone else. It is not superfluous, however, to produce another testimony.

Methodius, who was bishop of Olympus,* in Lycia, in the very beginning of the fourth century, was an admirer of Justin, whom he quotes more than once. The quotation with which we are now concerned occurs in a work by Methodius on the Resurrection, an extract from which has

* This is the account of the earliest writers who cite him; later authorities quote him as Bishop of Patara, also in Lycia, and Jerome stands alone in making him Bishop of Tyre. It is almost certain that in this Jerome made a mistake, of the origin of which Zahn gives an ingenious explanation. Zahn thinks that the idea that Methodius was Bishop of Patara is also a mistake, originating in the fact that the scene of one of his dialogues is laid in that place.

been preserved by Photius (see p. 363). But here we have occasion to see the convenience of the modern device of inverted commas, which enables us to see at a glance how far a quotation is meant to extend. The want of some such mark left it uncertain how much belonged to Justin and what to Methodius. Otto, in his edition of Justin, only prints one sentence as Justin's: the next sentence is introduced with a φησί; but it is free to the reader to take this as a word used by Photius in continuing his extract from Methodius, or as itself part of the extract, and as used by Methodius in continuing his extract from Justin. The doubt has been set at rest by the recovery of the passage of Methodius through a source independent of Photius.* It has thus become apparent that the second sentence, which contains a formal quotation from Paul, belongs to Justin as well as the first; and internal evidence confirms this conclusion. Both Methodius and Justin assert the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the body; and both have to answer the objection that Paul has said that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor. xv. 50). Methodius first gives his own answer, namely, that what Paul here means by 'flesh' is not literal flesh, but only the irrational impulse to fleshly lusts. But he goes on then to cite Justin's way of dealing with the same objection, in which quite a different answer is given. 'True,' says Justin, 'the body does not inherit the kingdom of God; it is inherited by the kingdom of God. That which lives inherits; that which is mortal is inherited. If the kingdom of God, which is life, were inherited by the body, life would be swallowed up by corruption. But now life inherits that which had died, that so death may be swallowed up by life unto victory, and that the corruptible should become possessed by incorruption.' The complete difference of this reply from that which Methodius himself had given is evidence enough that he is here quoting the words of another. We could easily believe without confirmation, that a work which Methodius—writing soon after A.D. 300—ascribed to Justin really belonged to him. But some confirmation is found in

* See Pitra, *Analecta Sacra*, III. p. 614; IV. p. 201.

the fact that an earlier writer, Irenæus, who also used Justin, has got hold of the same maxim *εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, οὐ κληρονομεῖ ἀλλὰ κληρονομεῖται ἡ σάρξ* (Iren. v. 9). Now what we are concerned with here is not the goodness of this solution of Justin's, but the fact that in the middle of the second century the authority of Paul's Epistles was owned alike by heretics and orthodox. Heretics thought that they had gained a palmary argument if they could produce a saying in these letters which seemed to make in their favour; and the orthodox felt it to be a matter of necessity that they should in some way reconcile their teaching with the sentence so produced.

I. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians.*—The foundation of the Church at Thessalonica is recorded, Acts xvii. It took place in the year 52, on Paul's second missionary journey. The first Epistle professes (iii. 6) to have been written on the return of Timothy, whom Paul had sent from Athens on a mission to the Thessalonian Church. This would be at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5) at the end of 52, or beginning of 53. I am inclined to dismiss, as absolutely frivolous, the objections which Baur and his followers have made to the acceptance of this date. For there is one passage in the Epistle—a passage which Baur has been so uncritical as to reject as un-Pauline—which carries on the face of it the stamp of early date. I mean the paragraph (iv. 13–18) which treats of the future happiness of those Christians who had died before the time when the Apostle wrote. The passage manifestly belongs to the time when it was thought likely to be an exceptional thing for a Christian to die before the second coming of our Lord, and when those who themselves expected to meet their Master on His coming needed to be consoled lest those dear friends whom death had carried off should lose somewhat of the felicity destined for the rest. Evidently it was only at the very beginning of Christianity, when the second coming of our Lord was yearly expected, and when deaths as yet had been but few, that the destinies of those who departed before the Second Advent could trouble the minds of surviving friends, or that they could be supposed in danger of losing something which the mass

of Christians would enjoy. Add to this, that if the Epistle had been, as has been imagined, fabricated after Paul's death, the forger would never have attributed to the Apostle the words 'we which remain'—words implying a belief on his part that it was possible he might live to witness our Lord's coming.

Looking on these considerations as absolutely decisive, I care little to discuss petty objections.* It is a little inconsistent that critics who condemn the book of the Acts as unhistorical, constantly, when they come to discuss Paul's Epistles, make disagreement with the history in the Acts a ground of rejection. In the present case the Epistle corrects an erroneous impression which the reader of the Acts might easily receive—I mean the impression that Paul only spent some three weeks in Thessalonica. The foundation of so flourishing a Church as the Epistle describes must have taken longer time; and we learn from Phil. iv. 16 that his stay was long enough to allow time for his Philippian friends twice to send him a gift of money. He gained at Thessalonica two of his most attached friends—Jason, whom we find afterwards in Paul's company at Corinth (Rom. xvi. 21), and Aristarchus, who had been charged with conveying the Thessalonian contributions of money to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4), and whom we find afterwards sharing Paul's journey to Rome and his imprisonment (Acts xxvii. 2, Col. iv. 10, Philem. 24). Thus we perceive that the preaching on three Sabbath days, which Luke records, only represents that part of the Apostle's work which was done in the Synagogue. After that he must, as on a previous occasion at Antioch in Pisidia, have turned to the Gentiles; for the Gentile element predominated in the Thessalonian Church (1 Thess. i. 9, ii. 14). But we find from Luke's narrative of what occurred in several cities, that

* One of those petty objections is worth repeating, because it turns on a curious coincidence, the discoverer of which, Holsten (*Jahrbücher f. Prot. Theol.* 1877) regarded it as proof demonstrative that our Epistle is later than the Apocalypse. In Rev. ii. 2, we read, 'I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience:' in 1 Thess. i. 3, 'Your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope.' Here Holsten contends we have the work of a later Paulinist, who has married the three Johannine words, works, labour, and patience, to the three Pauline, faith, hope, and charity.

nothing was more resented by the Jews than that one of their own nation should, instead of acquiescing in the decision passed on his doctrine by the religious heads of their community, disdainfully separate himself from his countrymen, and gather round him a schismatical society of Gentiles. We find, in the Acts, that on account of this conduct, which was regarded by the Jews as little less than apostasy, Paul was hunted by persecution from city to city. Five times, you will remember, he received from the Jews the forty stripes save one (2 Cor. xi. 24). If Baur had borne these facts in mind, he would scarcely have found a stumbling-block in the language in which Paul (ii. 14–16) expresses his indignation against 'the Jews' who 'forbade him to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved.' There is no warrant for asserting that the words 'the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost' (ii. 16) must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem. The 'wrath' is the 'indignation' of Dan. viii. 19, xi. 36; and εἰς τέλος is a common Old Testament phrase (Josh. x. 20; 2 Chron. xii. 12, xxxi. 1).

Again, it ought not to be thought strange that in this Epistle we should only read of the opposition Paul met with from unbelieving Jews, and that nothing should be said of his controversies with Jewish Christians. The letter was addressed to a Church which, as far as we know, had not yet been visited by any Christian preacher but Paul and his company. One trifling discrepancy with the Acts may be admitted. The Acts (xvii. 14) describe Silas and Timothy as remaining behind at Beroea when Paul was sent to Athens. But it appears (1 Thess. iii. 2) that Timothy had accompanied Paul to Athens, and had been sent back by the Apostle, in his anxiety to learn news of his Thessalonian converts. The two accounts agree in the main fact that Paul was left by himself at Athens, and the trifling disagreement shows that one account was not borrowed from the other.

Baur notes several coincidences between this and other Pauline Epistles,* but strange to say he uses these to disprove

* i. 5, 1 Cor. ii. 4; i. 6, 1 Cor. xi. 1; i. 8, Rom. i. 8; ii. 4, 1 Cor. ii. 4, Gal. i. 10, 2 Cor. i. 17; ii. 5, 2 Cor. vii. 2; ii. 6, 9, 2 Cor. xi. 9; ii. 7, 1 Cor. iii. 2.

the Pauline authorship. He holds that a letter, to be genuine, must be Pauline, but not too Pauline. If it contain phrases or thoughts for which we cannot find a parallel in Paul's acknowledged letters, Paul did not write it; but if the flavour of Paulinism be too strong for Baur's delicate susceptibilities, he detects a forger who betrays himself by a clumsy imitation of his master. By such methods of criticism it would be easy to prove any document spurious.

The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.—I said (p. 34) that I had at one time thought of treating the books of the New Testament in chronological order, beginning accordingly with St. Paul's Epistles. If I had not found other reasons for choosing a different course, I should have been warned by Davidson's example to see how much there is arbitrary and uncertain in the chronological arrangement. Adopting that plan, he began the first edition of his new Introduction with this Second Epistle to the Thessalonians; for he had accepted an idea of Grotius, which has been received with approval by some subsequent critics, that the letter which we, in conformity with universal Christian tradition, call the Second Epistle, came in order of time before that which we count the First. The arguments in support of this opinion do not seem to me strong enough to induce me to spend time in discussing them with you. In Davidson's second edition, the First Epistle heads the list of New Testament books; we have to look a long way down before we come to the Second; for it is now pronounced to be not genuine, but a later book than the Apocalypse of St. John. On the greater part of the arguments used for rejecting the book, I hardly think that Davidson himself can place much reliance. Thus, on comparing the opening of the two Epistles, he pronounces the Second un-Pauline, because, whereas Paul in the First Epistle had said 'we give thanks,' the Second Epistle says 'we are bound to thank God always as is meet:' whereas Paul had contented himself with speaking of his converts' faith and love, this writer exaggerates, and says that their faith groweth exceedingly and their love aboundeth. There is a great deal more of what I count 'childish' criticism: that is to say, criticism such as might proceed from a child

who insists that a story shall be always told him in precisely the same way. For instance, the commencement of ii. 11 with the words 'And for this cause,' is pronounced to be un-Pauline. Paul, we are gravely told, would have said, 'For this cause,' without the 'and.' When the list of un-Pauline phrases is exhausted, Davidson, following Baur's lead, goes on to condemn the Epistle for its too great likeness to Paul. The ideas are often borrowed or repeated from the First Epistle, and it is dependent on other Pauline Epistles.*

I hardly think it can be any of these arguments which induced Davidson to alter the opinion he expressed in his first edition, where he says (p. 27) 'The opinion of those critics who defend the authenticity of the First Epistle, but reject that of the Second, seems most improbable, and is a mediatizing view that cannot stand. Both must go together either in adoption or rejection. Baur is consistent in rejecting them; Hilgenfeld will have few followers in maintaining the Pauline origin of the one, and disputing that of the other.' How is it, then, that the prophet should so soon do his best to falsify his own prediction by becoming a follower of Hilgenfeld himself?

The reason for rejecting the Epistle can scarcely have been drawn from any of the small cavils of which I have given you specimens. The stumbling-block is found in the prophecy of the Man of Sin (ii. 1–12). It is not necessary for me to entangle you in any of the controversies which spring out of questions of interpretation of prophecy. We are here only concerned with the question of authorship—whether there is anything improbable in the supposition that such a prophecy should have been delivered at the date it must have been, if this Epistle was really written by St. Paul. Now considering the paucity of documents from which our knowledge is derived of the growth of opinion in the Apostolic age, and for half a

* 2 Thess. iii. 8 repeats 1 Thess. ii. 9; and iii. 10, 12, expands 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12; 2 Thess. iii. 14, follows 1 Cor. v. 9, 11; compare also 1 Cor. iv. 14. 'The Lord of peace' (iii. 16) is taken from 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 4, iii. 13, are derived from Gal. i. 6, v. 10, vi. 9, respectively. The reader must decide whether he will take these coincidences as arguments for or against the Pauline authorship.

century after the death of the last Apostle, I cannot sufficiently admire the courage of critics who, from their own sense of the fitness of things, assign dates for the first appearance of each phase of ritual or doctrine, and then condemn any document that refuses to fall in with their theory. It is true that apocalyptic prediction is in our minds chiefly associated with the Book of the Revelation of St. John; but I know no reason whatever for imagining that it was only about the year 70 that the minds of Christians began to occupy themselves with the thoughts of the second coming of our Lord, and the circumstances that should attend it. Those who own the First Epistle must allow that at the time when that was written the second coming of our Lord had a prominent place in the Apostle's teaching. There are traces also that the prophecies of Daniel were studied in connexion with that event; and in this Christians seem to have had the sanction of their Master. Taking the very lowest view of the authenticity of the Gospels, it still seems to me unreasonable to doubt that the 24th Matthew and the parallel chapters of the other Gospels record in substance a real discourse of our Lord. The description (Matt. xxiv. 30, 31) of our Lord coming in the clouds of heaven (see also Matt. xxvi. 64), and sending His angels with a 'great sound of a trumpet,' seems to me to have prompted both St. Paul's phrase, 'the last trumpet,' in 1 Cor. xv. 52, and the description in 1 Thess. iv. of our Lord descending with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, when His people should be caught up to Him in the clouds. It is undeniable then that, long before the year 70, eschatological speculation was a subject of Christian thought. We have not materials to write its history, and I marvel at the assurance of the man who pretends that he so knows all about the progress of Christian ideas on the subject in the fifteen years between 54 and 69, that while he feels it to be quite credible that such a forecast of the end of the dispensation as is contained in 2 Thess. ii. might have been written at the latter of these two dates, he is quite sure it could not have been written at the former. There would, indeed, be some foundation for such an assertion, if it could be said that the view presented in the Second Epistle contradicts that taken in the

first; but this is not so. The one Epistle presents our Lord's second coming as possibly soon, the other as not immediate —as needing that certain prophetic preliminary signs should first be fulfilled. It is quite conceivable that the teaching of the same man should present these two aspects. If no argument for late date can be founded on the passage in 2 Thess. which I have been discussing, I know of no other worth attention. We do not quite know what interval of time separates the two Epistles. Perhaps it may be longer than is generally supposed.

In respect of external attestation, no New Testament book stands higher than these Epistles. They are repeatedly used without suspicion by Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian.* They are included in the list of Pauline Epistles given in the Muratorian Fragment which I have quoted (p. 50). They were included in the Apostolicon of Marcion in the first half of the second century. There are what I count traces of their use by Clement of Rome (*c.* 38), while their employment by Ignatius and Polycarp is so distinct that the argument can only be evaded by denying the authenticity of these remains.† The passage about the 'Man of Sin' is plainly referred to by Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 110).

I must not omit to notice the token of genuineness given at the end of the Epistle, namely, that the salutation was written with the Apostle's own hand. All Paul's Epistles end with the salutation in an expanded or abridged form, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.' And it appears that even though the rest of the Epistle was written by an amanuensis (as was that to the Romans by Tertius), the salutation was written by the Apostle's own hand. It is remarkable that precautions against forgery should have been so early found necessary. The Apostle shows also his fears

* For example: Iren. v. 6; Clem. Al., *Strom.* iv. 12; Tert. *De Res. Carn.* 24.

† Ignat. *ad Polycarp.* 1, *ad Ephes.* 10; Polycarp, *cc.* 2, 4, 11. I am disposed to agree with Zahn, that when Polycarp speaks of epistles to the Philippian Church, it is because the Epistles to the neighbouring Thessalonian Church were united in his collection with the Epistle to the Philippians. Polycarp uses 2 Thess. i. 4, as if addressed to the Philippians.

of it in cautioning the Thessalonians not to be misled by any Epistle as from him. It is remarkable also that this expression, 'In every epistle so I write' (iii. 17) should be found in only the second of Paul's Epistles which have reached us. The inference seems plain that Paul must have written other letters that have not come down to us. And this is a conclusion intrinsically not improbable, and which I see no reason for rejecting. For I suppose there is no greater reason for thinking that every letter of an inspired Apostle must necessarily be extant, than there is for thinking that we must have an account preserved of every sermon he preached. We know from the end of St. John's Gospel, what our own reason would have otherwise told us, that the portion of our Blessed Lord's own words and deeds which His Spirit has preserved to us, bears no proportion to that which has been allowed to remain unrecorded. In the case of Apostolic letters we can conceive that the earlier, before the Apostle's authority was fully recognized, would be less carefully preserved. If one whom we dearly love is removed from us by death, we treasure up the relics of his writings, and often regret our own carelessness in having allowed papers to be destroyed which, because the writer was still with us, we valued lightly, but now would give much to recover. There is no improbability, then, in the loss of Apostolic letters, unless God worked a miracle to preserve them. We may believe that if the loss would have deprived us of knowledge necessary for our salvation, He would have interfered miraculously; but otherwise we have no ground for asserting that God would supernaturally prevent the loss of any of the written words of the Apostles, when He has permitted the loss of so many of the spoken words not only of them but of our Blessed Lord.

Another passage which implies a letter of Paul, not included in our Canon, is 1 Cor. v. 9, 'I wrote to you in my Epistle not to keep company with fornicators,' which though it has been interpreted to mean in the Epistle he was then writing, is, I think, better understood as referring to a lost previous letter. Colossians iv. 16, speaks of a letter from Laodicea. On this Laodicean letter I refer you to Lightfoot's

note* (*Colossians*, p. 340), merely saying here that I believe the letter has been rightly identified with that which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

II. We come now to the four Epistles whose genuineness is acknowledged by Baur, viz. Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians. There being no necessity to give formal proof of what is not seriously disputed, I do not trouble myself to lay before you the external attestation to these Epistles, but will only remark that, though amply sufficient, it is not at all superior to that which can be produced on behalf of some of the epistles which Baur disputes; nay possibly, perhaps, not quite as strong. But what has silenced controversy is the note of early date stamped on these Epistles by the character of their contents. St. Luke has informed us (Acts xv.) that warm controversy arose in the Christian Church at an early period of its history on the question whether it was obligatory on Gentile converts to Christianity to submit to the rite of circumcision. This question evidently would arise, as an urgent practical one, the first time that heathen were admitted in any numbers into the Church, and would have to be speedily settled one way or other; and, in point of fact, it *was* settled so rapidly that Christian literature is almost silent on the subject. It is dealt with in the letters now under consideration, which not only bear indisputable marks of common authorship, but have every appearance of having been written at nearly the same time. In no other New Testament book do we find any trace of a struggle to impose on Gentile converts the obligation of circumcision, nor is there any sign of controversy on the subject in the documents of the sub-

* The reader will find in Lightfoot the forged Epistle to the Laodiceans, which was clearly intended to pass for the Epistle referred to in the Colossians. It is only extant in Latin; but Lightfoot gives good reasons for believing the original language to have been Greek. It is short, and is a mere cento of passages from the genuine letters, containing scarcely a single original word. It was in circulation in St. Jerome's time (*De Viris Illust.* 5), and had previously been mentioned by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*in Coloss.* iv. 16, I. 314, Swete). It is doubtful whether it is this Epistle which is referred to in the Muratorian Fragment (see p. 50); for we should not otherwise take this forgery to be so early. Marcion had in his Canon an Epistle to the Laodiceans, but this was only what we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians (Tert. *adv. Marc.* v. 17).

Apostolic age, such as the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas. Nay, the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, though intensely Jewish in their character, and bitterly opposed to Paul, make no attempt to re-open this question; and the principle for which Paul contended is acquiesced in, namely, that uncircumcised men might be members of the Christian Church. There can, therefore, be no doubt as to the early date of letters which exhibit this long-buried controversy as the burning question of the day.

A second note of early date is what these letters disclose as to the resistance made at the time of their composition to the acknowledgment of Paul's Apostolic authority. With the multiplication of Churches, claiming Paul as their founder, his Apostleship soon ceased to be disputed within the pale of the Christian Church; nay, from a very early period he came to be habitually spoken of as *the* Apostle, a title which he no doubt owed to the fact that his letters soon ceased to be the exclusive property of the several Churches to which they were addressed, and became the manual of Apostolic instruction used in the public reading of widely-separated Churches. But it appears that the party which insisted on the necessity of circumcision set aside Paul's opposition by disparaging his authority as inferior to that of the original Twelve. Consequently in two of the Epistles now under consideration the assertion and establishment of Paul's claims to Apostolic authority have a prominent place. It is, therefore, a note of high antiquity that it should have been necessary, when these letters were written, to give elaborate proof of what very soon no one within the pale of the Church dreamed of doubting.

St. Luke informs us (Acts xv.) that it was after Paul's first missionary journey in which 'the door of faith had been opened to the Gentiles,' that controversy was first raised at Antioch by visitors from Jerusalem, who insisted on the circumcision of the new converts. We are told that, in consequence of these disputes, Barnabas and Paul went up to Jerusalem, where an arrangement was made as to the obligations of Gentile Christians, on terms satisfactory to Paul.

We are told, then, that Paul made, in company with Silas, a second missionary journey, in which he made known the terms of this arrangement to the Churches previously formed, and, no doubt, gave corresponding instruction to the new Churches which he founded. Among these new Churches were those of Macedonia; and it is a confirmation of St. Luke's account of the success of Paul's visit to Jerusalem in the suppression of disputes for a time, that in the Epistles to the Thessalonians Paul complains of no adversaries but the unbelieving Jews, and finds it necessary to give no warning against Jewish Christians, who strove to impose the yoke of circumcision on the Gentiles. There is a striking difference of tone when we take up the Epistle to the Galatians, which has every mark of having been written under a tumult of fresh feelings of surprise, grief, and indignation, roused by the tidings that converts, whom he had had every reason to believe to be warmly attached to him (iv. 15), had given a credulous hearing to men who disparaged his authority, and had been induced by them to believe, in opposition to what St. Paul had taught them, that they could not be saved unless they submitted to circumcision, and other Mosaic ordinances.

Accordingly, the Epistle begins by an assertion of his Apostleship. It is known that the name 'Apostle' was given by the Jews to the envoys despatched by the rulers of their race on any foreign mission, especially to those charged with collecting the Temple tribute. We learn from the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' (see Lect. XXVI.) that in the Jewish Christian Churches the same name continued to be given to missionaries sent forth from the mother Church. We may, therefore, reasonably conjecture that the name 'Apostle' was claimed by the visitors from Judea, who, as formerly at Antioch, inculcated on the Gentile Churches the necessity of circumcision. We can thus understand the emphasis with which Paul declares at the outset that he was an Apostle, but not as being, like them, an emissary sent by men; nay, further, that the Divine commission which he claimed to have received had not been given him through the instrumentality of men, but directly by our Lord Himself. He proceeds, by a narra-

tive of his own history, to vindicate his claim to speak with authority independent of the other Apostles, showing at the same time that his teaching had their full sanction.

Passing, then, from the personal question, he argues that the Gentiles, by submission to the law of Moses, would surrender their claim to an inheritance of earlier date than Moses, namely, the covenant of promise made by God with Abraham, 400 years before Moses. The promise was given to Abraham because of his faith—'He believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness'—and it was made to Abraham *and his seed*. That seed was Christ, and they are to be counted the true seed of Abraham who are Christ's, and who have the faith of Abraham. As for those Israelites after the flesh, who were under bondage to the Mosaic Law, they might be children of Abraham, but not heirs of the promises to Abraham. Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman; the one born after the flesh, the other through the promise. As then, so now, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit. But what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondmaid and her son; for the son of the bondmaid shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.

But, though the heirs of promise must not now be under bondage to the law, there had been a time when they had been rightfully under subjection to it. The heir, as long as he is a child, is under subjection to tutors and governors appointed by the father. The law had a temporary use in training and preparing for Christ those who had for a time been placed in subjection to it. It made men conscious of sin, and pronounced a curse on disobedience, from which itself was powerless to deliver. Thus, the impossibility of obtaining justification by the law being made evident, it became clear that it is only by faith that the just can live—faith in Christ, who has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. So under the tutorship of the law, men were taught to seek salvation through faith through the promise to Christ; a promise not limited to one nation, for God said to Abraham, 'In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.' It matters not whether a

man be Jew or Greek, bond or free; if he be Christ's he is Abraham's seed, and heir of his promise.

An abstract has here been given of so much of the argument of the Epistle to the Galatians as is necessary for comparison with the Epistle to the Romans, which of all Paul's letters has the closest affinity with the Epistle under consideration.

To speak first of the points of likeness, we find (Rom. iv. 3) the same Old Testament passage quoted, 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness' (Gal. iii. 6), and, it may, he added, with a formula of citation used also in Galatians (iv. 30), 'What saith the Scripture?' And the same argument is founded on it. The promise was made to Abraham not through the law, not as earned by any works, but through the righteousness of faith: it was antecedent to the law; nay, antecedent to the institution of the rite of circumcision; the promise, therefore belongs to those who have like faith to that which Abraham had before he was circumcised. Thus, in fulfilment of the promise that Abraham should be father of many nations, his children are not limited to the Jewish nation. Nay, those who are merely his descendants after the flesh, are not his true children. 'Neither because they are Abraham's seed, are they all children; but, "in Isaac shall thy seed be called." That is, it is not the children of the flesh that are children of God: but the "children of the promise" are counted for the seed' (Rom. ix. 7, 8). This is the same argument as that which leads up (Gal. iv. 28) to the statement, 'We brethren, as Isaac was, are children of the promise.'

Again in the Epistle to the Romans, as well as in that to the Galatians, the Apostle has to deal with the difficulty, how is he to reconcile his admission that the Mosaic Law came from God, with his teaching that it is not binding on Christians? And in Rom. vii. he expounds a doctrine as to the temporary uses served by the Mosaic Law identical with that in the Epistle to the Galatians; so that the former exposition has been employed to clear up ambiguity in the latter (see Gal. iii. 19).

Beside the general agreement in the arguments by which in both Epistles the same thesis is maintained, viz., that 'by

the works of the law shall no flesh be justified' (Gal. ii. 16; Rom. iii. 20), there are considerable verbal agreements, so numerous as not only to leave no doubt that both letters had the same author, but also to suggest that the composition of the two could not be separated by any long interval of time. Thus the words of the thesis just quoted are taken from Psalm cxliii. 2, but modified in both places in the same way, viz., by the introduction of the phrase, 'the works of the law,' and by the alteration of 'no man living' into 'no flesh.' The 7th of Romans just referred to speaks (15–23) of the conflict in a man between the 'law in his members' and the 'law in his mind,' the result of which is that his conduct is constantly different from that which his will approves. There is a quite parallel passage (Gal. v. 17), and in both places the remedy for the misery of this conflict is shown to be to 'walk by the Spirit.' A few examples of parallel passages may be added:—

Rom. viii. 14–17: For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.

Gal. iv. 5–7: That we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

Rom. vi. 6–8: Our old man is crucified with him. . . . Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

Gal. ii. 20: I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.

Rom. xiii. 9: [The law] is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. . . . Love is the fulfilling of the law.

Gal. v. 14: All the law is fulfilled in one word, namely: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

Rom. xv. 15: Grace was given me of God that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles.

Rom. xi. 13: Inasmuch as I am an apostle of Gentiles.

Gal. ii. 7: I had been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision as Peter with the Gospel of the circumcision; for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision, wrought for me also with the Gentiles.

This list, which might be considerably extended, is enough to put beyond controversy the close affinity of the two Epistles. But there is a striking difference. We do not find in the Epistle to the Romans any of those autobiographical details with which the Epistle to the Galatians opens. The writer seems to feel himself under no necessity to vindicate his Apostleship, or his right to speak with as much authority as the original Twelve. Paul's claim to be an Apostle is made in the opening salutation, and repeated (xi. 13), but it is not treated as likely to be contested, or as needing proof. Further, the Epistle to the Romans is a calm exposition of Christian doctrine, without any trace of the personal feelings which exhibit themselves so strongly in the Epistle to the Galatians. No doubt this difference is to a certain extent accounted for by the fact that Paul in writing to the Church of Rome, a place that he had not yet visited, was addressing comparative strangers; while, in writing to the Galatians, he could not but be deeply moved by grief and indignation, that converts who had once shown the strongest personal attachment to him should now appear to be abandoning his teaching. This consideration sufficiently accounts for the difference of tone between the two letters, but not for the absence of any indication that the writer expected his claim to Apostleship to be contested; and, therefore, the most natural inference is, that the Epistle to the Romans was written later than the Epistle to the Galatians, and at a time when Paul's authority had ceased to be disputed.

This inference is confirmed when we include in our examination the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. This Epistle exhibits Paul as then opposed by men who disparaged his Apostolic authority, as much hurt by the ingratitude of some of his converts, and as anxious in his mind as to the reception he should meet with when he should arrive. The Epistle to the Romans, written after his arrival in Corinth, shows that the attempt to dispute his Apostleship had entirely collapsed, and that he could write in complete tranquillity of mind. There is strong likeness—less, however, in verbal expression than in general tone of feeling—between the manner in which disparagement of Paul's authority is dealt with in 2 Cor. and

in Galatians.* But though the personal question is dealt with in 2 Cor., we do not find there the argumentation against the necessity of circumcision which occupies so much of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. This favours Lightfoot's view, that the tidings which elicited the Epistle to the Galatians reached Paul later than the composition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The First Epistle to the Corinthians is not without coincidences with that to the Galatians,† though fewer in number, as is natural, if Lightfoot's arrangement of the order of the Epistles is right. It does not need explanation, that circumcision should, in the last passages which I quote in the note, be treated as a thing indifferent, but that the insisting on circumcision as necessary to salvation should be treated (Gal. v. 2) as subversive of the Gospel of Christ.

The generally received chronology of Paul's life assigns the second missionary journey in which the Apostle went through 'the Phrygian and Galatian country' to the years 51 and 52, and the third journey in which he visited the same districts again to the year 54. Then succeed three years at Ephesus, shortly before leaving which place, in 57, he writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians. From Ephesus he travels through Macedonia, and arrives at Corinth, before leaving which place, in 58, he writes his Epistle to the Romans.

Before quitting this subject I must say something as to the ambiguity of the name 'Galatia.' It may be a geographical term, denoting the district lying north of Phrygia and Cappadocia, which derived its name from the Gallic tribes which found a settlement there, and which was divided into three cantons, whose principal cities were: Pessinus, at the lower or south-western extremity, where it borders on Phrygia; Ancyra, in the centre; and Tavium, in the north-eastern extremity, where it borders on Pontus. Or, Galatia may denote a political division, viz., the Roman province of Galatia, which

* Lightfoot gives the parallels: Gal. iii. 13, 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. vi. 7, 2 Cor. ix. 6; Gal. i. 6, 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. iv. 14, 2 Cor. xii. 7; Gal. vi. 15, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iv. 17, 2 Cor. xi. 2; Gal. i. 20, 2 Cor. v. 11; Gal. iii. 3, 2 Cor. viii. 6; Gal. i. 9, v. 21, 2 Cor. xiii. 2.

† 1 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 6, Gal. v. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 19, Gal. v. 6, vi. 15.

included, in addition to Galatia proper, which has been just described, part of Phrygia, Pisidia and Lycaonia; and, in particular, the cities of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, Paul's visits to which on his first missionary journeys are related at length by St. Luke. Accordingly Renan and others suppose that it is the Churches of these cities which we are to understand when Paul speaks of the 'Churches of Galatia.' But it is to be observed that St. Luke never uses the word Galatia in reference to these cities. It is in his account of St. Paul's second and third missionary journeys that he speaks of him as traversing 'the Phrygian and Galatian country' (xvi. 6), and as revisiting the 'Galatian country and Phrygia" (xviii. 23). This language would lead us to think of St. Paul, not as evangelizing Galatia proper, but only as, in the course of his northward journey, going through the borderland, which, though politically Galatia, was geographically Phrygia. St. Paul's letter, however, addressed to the Galatians (and see, in particular, iii. 1) favours the opinion that the Apostle did preach the Gospel in Galatia proper. And we are the less disposed to press any argument from St. Luke's silence, when we observe how very little is told of the Apostle's work in Asia on this occasion. St. Luke appears to have first joined Paul's company at Troas (Acts xvi. 10), where he finds the Apostle attended by a new travelling companion, Timothy. St. Luke would naturally hear from this new friend the circumstances of his joining Paul, and these, accordingly, are told in the Acts, but scarcely anything else about Paul's labours before Luke had joined him. We gather, however, from Acts xvi. 6, that it had been Paul's original intention to travel westward from Antioch in Pisidia through the Roman province of Asia, meaning probably to reach the sea at Ephesus. We do not know in what way the Divine intimation was given which caused him to alter his course in a northerly direction; but we may reasonably conjecture that hindrances to his journey in the westward direction presented themselves which either he himself or some prophetic member of the party instructed the rest to recognize as providential guidance. We are tempted to connect with this the statement Gal. iv. 13, the most obvious meaning of which is, that Paul's work in the Galatian district

arose out of an illness of his. The illness of the Apostle may have caused arrangements to fall through (and, possibly, more than once), which had been made for the journey into proconsular Asia. Renan concludes, from the fact that St. Luke next tells of Paul's arrival on the borders of Mysia, which lies far to the north-west of Antioch or Iconium, that his journey must have been altogether in that direction, and that we cannot suppose him to have gone to Galatia proper, which would be much to the East of his way. But it is not correct to describe Paul as in this missionary journey 'making for' Mysia or any other particular place. He was evidently prepared to follow God's providential guidance whithersoever it might lead him. We cannot tell what invitations to join their party he may have received from Jewish acquaintances proceeding in the Galatian direction, or what assurances of hospitable reception when they reached their destination. Both Pessinus and Ancyra were cities to which Jewish commercial speculation had made its way. We may infer from Gal. iv. 13 that a return of illness obliged the Apostle to spend a much longer time in the Galatian country than he had originally intended.

Though I understand the 'Galatians' addressed in the Epistle to have been inhabitants of some part of Galatia proper, I lay little stress on explanations that have accounted for the suddenness of the Galatian abandonment of the Gospel as taught by Paul, by the fact that these people were largely of Celtic extraction, a race proverbial for fickleness. It may be doubted whether Celts formed the predominating element in the Churches of Galatia, which no doubt were also largely recruited from the Greeks and Jews, who in considerable numbers dwelt in the same country. But, in any case, men of different nationalities share in a common nature, and people often make mistakes in fancying they see tokens of national peculiarity in what is but the result of the working of the common human nature. When the Galatians were first converted they knew no other Christian teacher than Paul; but they learned from him to recognize Jerusalem as the head quarters of the religion, and they had heard of the Twelve as having received Apostleship from Christ Himself. It needs

no theory as to the race-extraction of these converts to account for their being profoundly influenced when teachers came among them, claiming to speak with the authority of the parent Church, and informing them that new conditions must still be complied with before they could be recognized as perfect Christians. Nor need we wonder if, when they pleaded that Paul, who had founded their Church, had never insisted on these conditions, they were staggered at being told that Paul himself had been but a new convert, and was not one whose authority could be set in opposition to that of the Apostles whom Christ had appointed.

Before quitting this group of Epistles, I may mention some doubts that have been raised as to the concluding chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. The Epistle, previously to this, closes with a benediction at the end of chap. xv. Let me say, in passing, that we have one concluding benediction too many in the Authorized Version. Both at xvi. 20, and 24, we have 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.' The oldest authorities differ as to which place this benediction ought to occupy; but there is no good MS. authority for putting it in both places. The Revised Version omits it, *v.* 24. In some MSS. the concluding doxology (xvi. 25–27) is put at the end of ch. xiv. In addition to the fact that the Epistle seems to finish without chap. xvi., it has been remarked as strange that Paul should have known so many at Rome, which he had never visited, while he sends no salutation to individuals in his Epistle to the Church of Ephesus, where he had lived three years. On these grounds some reject this chapter. Renan imagines that the Epistle was a circular addressed to different Churches, with a different conclusion for each, and with his usual courage he picks out their several portions. He assigns the list of names to whom salutations were sent, as the conclusion of the Epistle sent to one Church, that of Ephesus; the list of names from whom salutations are sent as the conclusion of that to another, and the doxology as of that to a third. Strange not to see that these three fit together, and make an harmonious whole.

I cannot seriously discuss what is asserted with so little evidence. It is no uncommon thing with ourselves to add a

postscript to a letter, and there is nothing to call for explanation if Paul, even though he had brought his letter to a close in the 15th chapter, should add a postscript. Considering how people pressed to Rome from all parts of the Empire, we have nothing to wonder at if Paul had many friends at Rome, even though he had not visited it. When he did eventually visit Rome, there were friends there who came to meet him, some as far as Appii Forum, a distance of forty-three miles. It is, I own, a little surprising that the Epistle to the Ephesians does not contain a corresponding list of salutations. However, what has been ingeniously urged on the other side is worth mentioning. It is said that a man writing to a large circle of friends, because it would be invidious to mention some names and omit others, naturally might prefer to mention none: and that, accordingly, in Paul's Epistles to the Churches where he had personally laboured, those of Corinth and Thessalonica, no names are mentioned; while several names occur in the conclusion of the Epistle to the Church of Colossæ, a place where the Apostle apparently had never been.

I should not think it impossible that the Epistle to the Ephesians, as originally written, may have contained a postscript chapter of private salutations like that which ends the Epistle to the Romans, and that this postscript was not copied when the Epistle was transcribed for the use of other Churches. But, another, and more common explanation is, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was a circular not written to that Church exclusively. Certain it is, some of the most ancient copies omitted the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the inscription. Origen, for instance, read, the saints 'that are,' and explained τοῖς οὖσιν as the saints which are really so; and in this he is followed by St. Basil. And the omission of Ephesus is found in some very ancient MSS. at this day (א, B). But since Origen's explanation is extremely improbable, Archbishop Ussher conjectured that the original letter was a circular, containing after the words 'the saints that are' a blank for the name of the Church addressed. Marcion filled it up with the name Laodicea, and called this the Epistle to the Laodiceans.

Lightfoot has noted (*Journal of Philology*, II. 264) certain

peculiarities in some MSS. which make it probable that an edition of the Epistle to the Romans also had some circulation in which both the name Rome in the address and the last two chapters were omitted. On these peculiarities he founds the hypothesis that the Apostle, at a later period of his life, wished to give a wider circulation to the Epistle he had written to the Church of Rome; that, in order to adapt it to this end, he omitted the mention of Rome in the beginning, as also the last two chapters containing personal matters; and that he then, for the first time, added as a termination the doxology, xvi. 25–27. This hypothesis was combated by Dr. Hort in the same Journal (III. 51), and again defended by its author (III. 193). The discussion will well repay study; but the true solution of the problem belongs to a period earlier than any extant Christian history—the period, namely, when the Epistles first passed out of the exclusive possession of the Churches to which they were addressed, and became the common property of all Christians.

III. *The Epistles of the Imprisonment.*—Among these, I think it necessary to say little concerning the Epistle to the Philippians, Baur's objections to its genuineness having been pronounced futile by critics not disposed to think lightly of his authority—Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Schenkel, Reuss, Davidson, Renan,* and others. Baur has pronounced this

* A Frenchman cannot construct a drama without a love story; and Renan, by the help of this Epistle, with some countenance from Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 6), has contrived to find one in the life of St. Paul. He translates (*Saint Paul*, p. 148) γνήσιε σύζυγε (Phil. iv. 3) 'ma chère épouse;' and when afterwards he has occasion to speak of Lydia, does so with the addition, 'sa vraie épouse' (*L'Antechrist*, pp. 18, 22). Hilgenfeld, who will not be suspected of any undue bias in favour of Episcopacy, interprets the passage of the president of the Philippian Church: 'Anstatt mit Renan in γνήσιε σύνζυγε die Purpurhändlerin Lydia von Paulus als "meine liebe Gemahlin" angeredet werden zu lassen, denkt man besser an den eigentlichen Vorsteher der philippischen Gemeinde' (*Einleitung*, p. 345). If this president were Epaphroditus, the bearer of the letter, then the address to him, without mention of his name, would be quite intelligible (see Dr. Gwynn's note in the *Speaker's Commentary*). Paul's earliest Epistle (1 Thess. v. 12) attests the existence of an organised Christian ministry (see the bishop of Derry's Introduction in the *Speaker's Commentary*); the present Epistle (i. 1) informs us that there were Church Officers called ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι. Both titles are found again in the Pastoral Epistles. The former, as the name of a Church officer, only appears once elsewhere in N. T., in Paul's speech at Miletus (Acts xx.

Epistle to be dull, uninteresting, monotonous, characterized by poverty of thought, and want of originality. But one only loses respect for the taste and skill of the critic who can pass such a sentence on one of the most touching and interesting of Paul's letters. So far is it from showing signs of having been manufactured by imitation of the other Epistles, that it reveals aspects of Paul's character which the other letters had not presented. In 2 Cor. we see how the Apostle could write when wounded by ingratitude and suspicion from children in the faith who failed to return his affection; in this Epistle how he could address loving disciples for whom he had not a word of rebuke. Elsewhere we are told (Acts xx. 34; 1 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 3) how the Apostle laboured with his own hands for his support, and declared that he would rather die than let the disinterestedness of his preaching be suspected; here we find (iv. 10–19) that there was no false pride in his independence, and that when there was no likelihood of misrepresentation, he could gracefully accept the ungrudged gifts of affectionate converts. Elsewhere we read only of his reprobation of Christian teachers who corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel; here we are told (i. 18) of his satisfaction that, by the efforts even of those whose motives were not pure, the Gospel of Christ should be more widely published.

The Epistle to Philemon being now generally accepted by all critics whose opinion deserves respect, I need say nothing about its genuineness, and have no time for other comments which that charming letter suggests.

The Epistle to the Colossians.—The external attestation to this letter is all that can be desired. It is only within the last fifty years that anyone has doubted it. It is used without suspicion by Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian, and was included in Marcion's Canon. The description of our Lord (Col. i. 15) as πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως is copied by Justin Martyr twice verbally (*Trypho*, 85, 138), and twice in

28). The inference from Phil. iv. 3, that one of the Church officers had some pre-eminence over the others, does not seem to me to be negatived by the fact that no notice of such pre-eminence appears in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians.

substance (84, 100). The same expression is used by Theophilus of Antioch (ii. 22). Davidson owns (ii. 177) that, 'as far as external evidence goes, the Epistle is unanimously attested in ancient times.'

We turn then to the internal evidence; and the most trying test is to examine the personal references at the end of the Epistle. On the face of these there appears a close connexion with the letter to Philemon.* The same names occur in both—Epaphras, Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas—as names of Paul's companions, Onesimus as a bearer of both letters, Archippus as one of those addressed. Yet there are differences which preclude the idea that the Epistle to the Colossians was manufactured out of the shorter Epistle. The longer Epistle names Jesus, surnamed Justus, in addition to those mentioned in the shorter; while it says nothing about Philemon, the principal personage in the latter. Tychicus is named as the principal bearer of the longer Epistle; but from the nature of the case, Onesimus alone would be entrusted with the shorter. Again, the title fellow-prisoner† is given to Aristarchus in the Epistle to the Colossians; but in that to Philemon, it is given not to him, but to Epaphras. Combining the Epistles, we obtain a clear and consistent account of the occasion of both. The fugitive slave Onesimus, formerly a resident at Colossæ, is converted at Rome by Paul, who desires to send him back to his master. There is also with Paul at the time another Colossian, Epaphras, apparently the evangelist of the Churches on the Lycus (i. 7), through whose affectionate remembrance of these

* On this connexion Davidson, in his discussion of the Epistle to the Colossians, does not say a single word; Hilgenfeld touches on it very lightly. Renan's literary instinct often keeps him straight where German critics had gone astray. He had not been without difficulties as to the larger Epistle, but he finds it impossible to get over the fact of the connexion of the two. He says of the Epistle to the Colossians (*Saint Paul*, p. xi.): 'Elle présente même beaucoup de traits qui repoussent l'hypothèse d'un faux. De ce nombre est sûrement sa connexité avec le billet à Philémon. Si l'épître est apocryphe, le billet est apocryphe aussi; or, peu de pages ont un accent de sincérité aussi prononcé; Paul seul, autant qu'il semble, a pu écrire ce petit chef-d'œuvre.'

† The most probable meaning of the title is that these disciples shared St. Paul's lodgings, and thereby voluntarily subjected themselves to some restrictions of liberty from the *surveillance* of the soldier in charge of him

Churches the Apostle has heard much of their prosperous spiritual state (iv. 12, 13). He therefore joins Onesimus with Tychicus, whom he was sending on a mission to the Churches of Asia, and while giving the former a private letter to his master, entrusts them jointly with a public letter to the Church. Archippus, who is addressed in the salutation of the shorter letter, is commonly supposed to have been a son of Philemon: if not that, he could only have been the chief minister of the Church to which he belonged. It would seem from the order in which he is mentioned that the scene of his labours was not Colossæ, but Laodicea. Possibly at the time of writing, Philemon might also have gone to reside there. If this were so, it would be natural that there should also be a public letter to the Church over which Archippus presided; and we find from iv. 16, that in point of fact there was a companion letter to be found at Laodicea. I feel little doubt that this is the letter, a duplicate of which was taken by Tychicus to Ephesus. where Paul had resided so long, and which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians. But we have not yet come to discuss that letter: suffice it, then, to say now, that on the supposition of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Colossians all the details of Paul's history which are indicated come out with perfect clearness; while, if you want to convince yourselves of the unreasonableness of the opposite supposition, you have only to take the Epistle to Philemon—acknowledged to be genuine—and try to conceive how a forger would be likely to utilize its contents for the manufacture of a letter intended to pass as contemporaneous. I am sure no forger could devise anything which has such a ring of truth as the Epistle to the Colossians.

What, then, are the reasons why we are to reject a document coming to us with the best possible credentials, and presenting several characteristics which seem to exclude the hypothesis of fraud? Three reasons are alleged. The first I shall not delay to discuss at length: I mean the argument founded on the occurrence of certain words in this Epistle which are not found in Paul's previous letters. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that a man writing a new

composition must not, on pain of losing his identity, employ any word that he has not used in a former one. Even Baur, who acknowledged only four Epistles, could hardly employ this argument consistently—for there are great dissimilarities between the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians—but when the Pauline authorship of the Epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Philippians is acknowledged, as it now is, by all the best critics, it is admitted that we may disregard the objections made by Baur to these Epistles on the ground of differences of phraseology; and it is recognized that it is not unnatural that certain differences of language should show themselves in letters written by Paul at some distance of time from each other. In the course of a few years the vocabulary of any man is liable to be modified, but more especially is this likely to happen to one who, as Paul did, goes about a good deal, and converses with many new people.* Critics strangely forget the probable influence on Paul's language of his two years' residence in Rome. In the next century Rome was a hot-bed of heresy, all the leading Gnostic teachers having established schools there. We cannot but think it likely that in the first century also religious speculators of various kinds should find their way to Rome, and strive to gain disciples. What more natural than that some of them should visit the Apostle in his lodgings, and compare doctrines with him? And might it not be accounted a note of spuriousness if letters alleged to be written after a

* What I have said above was suggested by a remark of Dr. Mahaffy, which he has been good enough to put in writing for me :—

'The works of Xenophon show a remarkable variation in their vocabulary. Thus, I. and II. of the *Hellenica*, which are his earliest writings, before he travelled, contain very few Ionisms, Dorisms, &c., and are written in very pure Attic. His later tracts are full of un-Attic words, picked up from his changing surroundings; and, what is more curious, in each of them there are many words only used by him once; so that, on the ground of variation in diction, each single book might be, and indeed has been, rejected as non-Xenophontic. This variation not only applies to words which might not be required again, but to such terms as *εὐανδρία* (*Comm.* 3, 3, 12), varied to *εὐψυχία* (*Ven.* 10, 21), *εὐτολμία* (quoted by Stobæus), *ἀνδρειότης* (*Anab.* 6, 5, 14), all used only once. Every page in Sauppe's *Lexilogus Xen.* bristles with words only used once in this way. Now, of classical writers, Xenophon is perhaps (except Herodotus) the only man whose life corresponded to St. Paul's in its roving habits, which would bring him into contact with the spoken Greek of varying societies.'

long residence in Rome exhibited acquaintance with no phases of thought but those which are dealt with in the earlier letters?

The second objection is drawn from the Christology of the Epistle, the view of our Lord's Person and work which it presents being in close resemblance to the Logos doctrine of St. John. But is it so impossible that the doctrine of two Christian teachers should resemble each other? We have evidently here to do with an objection in which one brought up in the faith of the Church can feel no force before he has unlearned a good deal. But, without assuming anything as to the unlikelihood of Apostles disagreeing on a fundamental doctrine, when once it is acknowledged that the Johannine writings, instead of only originating late in the second century, were the work of a contemporary of St. Paul, then the interval in time between the composition of the Epistle to the Colossians and of the Gospel of St. John is reduced so much, that it becomes very rash to declare that what was accepted as sound doctrine at the later of the two periods could not have been believed in at the earlier. Add that, when we acknowledge the Epistle to the Philippians, the celebrated Christological passage (ii. 5–11) forces us to attribute to Paul such high doctrine as to our Lord's pre-existence and as to the pre-eminent dignity which He enjoyed before His humiliation, that I cannot understand how it should be pronounced inconceivable that one, whose conception of Christ was that expressed in the Philippians, should use concerning Him the language we find in the Colossians.

The third objection is the Gnostic complexion of the false teaching combated in the Colossian Epistle, which, we are told, could not have characterized any heresy existing in the time of St. Paul. But how is it known that it could not? What are the authorities which fix for us the date of the rise of Gnosticism with such precision that we are entitled to reject a document bearing all the marks of authenticity, if it exhibit too early traces of Gnostic controversies? The simple fact is, that we have no certain knowledge whatever about the beginnings of Gnosticism. We know that it was in full blow in the middle of the second century. The Church

writers to whom we owe our best knowledge of it wrote at the end of that century or the beginning of the next, and were much more busy in refuting the forms of heresy then prevalent than in exploring their antiquities. But if we desire to describe the first appearance of Gnostic tendencies, we have, outside the New Testament books, no materials; and if we assign a date from our own sense of the fitness of things, we are bound to do so with all possible modesty. 'Bishop Lightfoot,' says Davidson, 'following Neander, thinks that the Judaic Gnosticism combated in the Epistle to the Colossians was a heresy expressing "the simplest and most elementary conceptions" of the tendency of thought, so-called; one whose speculations were so "vague and fluctuating," as to agree with St. Paul's time.' From this view Davidson dissents, regarding the heretical tenets of the Colossian teachers as more definite than Lightfoot represents. I myself fully believe the bishop to be in the right; but for the purposes of the present argument I count it absolutely immaterial whether he is or not. When we have got a well-authenticated first century document, that document is evidence as to the state of opinion at the time when it was written; and whether the amount of Gnostic opinion which it reveals be much or little, we have no reason for rejecting its testimony, unless we have equally good countervailing testimony. But countervailing testimony deserving of regard, in this case there is none. Davidson says: 'Lightfoot labours without effect to date the opinions of the Colossian errorists before A.D. 70, for in doing so he is refuted not only by Hegesippus, who puts the first exhibitions of heretical Gnosis under Trajan, but by Clement of Alexandria, who dates them under Hadrian, and by Firmilian of Cæsarea, who dates them long after the Apostles.' Firmilian of Cæsarea! he might as well have said Theophylact. I think he misunderstands Firmilian; but it is useless to discuss the point; for what possible value can attach to the opinion which a writer of the middle of the third century held as to the extent to which Gnosticism had prevailed two hundred years before his own time?

There is no surer test of the merit of an historian than to

observe what are the authorities on which he builds his story. If you find him relying on such as are worthless, you may know that he does not understand his business. It would be unjust to Davidson if the present example were offered as a fair specimen of his sense of the value of authorities; and if he has not produced better, it is because there were no better to produce. If he appealed to the early hæresiologists his cause would be lost; for, following the lead of Justin Martyr, they commonly count Simon Magus as the parent of Gnosticism,* so that if their authority is to be regarded, the heresy existed in Apostolic times. Hegesippus, the earliest of the authorities on whom Davidson relies, wrote in the Episcopate of Eleutherus, that is to say, some time between 175 and 189. He is therefore more than a century later than the times concerning which he is appealed to as a witness; and he is later than Justin Martyr, whose testimony I have just quoted on the other side.† But, strange to say, Davidson himself thinks (ii. 38) that Hegesippus was acquainted with 1 Tim. vi. 20, and thence derived the expression 'Gnosis, falsely so called.' Hegesippus, therefore, must have believed that Gnosis existed in the Apostle's days. Thus it will be seen that the authorities that can be used to fix the date of the first appearance of Gnosticism are conflicting and untrustworthy; nor do I

* See Irenæus, I. xxiii. 4.

† The work of Hegesippus is lost; and in this case we have not even an extract from it, but only the report which Eusebius gives (iii. 32), in his own words, of the substance of what Hegesippus had said. For want of the context we cannot make a positive affirmation; but it appears to me that when Hegesippus says, that 'down to the times of Trajan the Church remained a pure and incorrupt virgin,' he had specially in view the Church of Jerusalem (compare Euseb. iv. 22). The Elkesaites were the heretics with whom Hegesippus, as a Christian of Palestine, would have most to deal, and the reign of Trajan was the very date they claimed for the revelation of their peculiar doctrines. They held a kind of doctrine of development, believing that the latest growth of time was the best, and that the full truth was not to come until error had preceded it. Until Paul had promulgated his erroneous doctrines, the revelations of Elkesai were not to be made. Hegesippus gave a different account of the matter. While the Apostles were alive heresies were obliged to burrow in secret; but when their sacred choir had departed, and the generation had passed away which had been vouchsafed the hearing of their inspired wisdom, then the preachers of knowledge, falsely so called, ventured to invade the Church, as if now bare and unprotected.

believe that, even if we had fuller information, it would be possible to name a definite date for its beginning. For I take the true history to be, that there came a wave of thought from without, in consequence of which certain ideas foreign to Christianity floated vaguely about, meeting in different quarters more or less acceptance, for some time before anyone formed these ideas into a system. With respect to the history of this undeveloped stage of Gnosticism, I hold the Epistle to the Colossians to be one of our best sources of information; and those who reject it, because it does not agree with their notions of what the state of speculation in the first century ought to be, are guilty of the unscientific fault of forming a theory on an insufficient induction of facts, and then rejecting a fact which they had not taken into account, because it does not agree with their theory.

The Epistle to the Ephesians.—'Among the letters which bear the name of Paul,' says Renan (*Saint Paul*, xxiii.), 'the Epistle to the Ephesians is perhaps the one of which there are most early quotations, as the composition of the Apostle of the Gentiles.' On internal grounds Renan has serious doubts as to the Pauline origin of this Epistle, and he throws out the idea that it may have been written under the Apostle's directions by Timothy, or some other of his companions; but he owns that the external evidence in its favour is of the highest character. It is a matter of course to say that it is recognized by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and in the Muratorian Fragment. The fact that it was among the Pauline Epistles owned by Marcion makes it unnecessary to cite authorities later than 140. There is what seems to me a distinct use of the Epistle by Clement of Rome; for when he exhorts to unity by the plea, 'Have we not one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?' (*c.* 46), I cannot think the resemblance merely accidental to 'one Spirit,' 'one hope of your calling' (Eph. iv. 4). There can be no doubt of the use of the Ephesians in what is called the Second Epistle of Clement; but though I think this is certainly older than the age of Irenæus, I do not know whether it is older than that of Marcion. The recognition of the Ephesians in the letter of Ignatius to the

same Church is beyond doubt. He addresses the Ephesians (*c.* 12) as Παύλου συμμύσται, a phrase recalling Eph. iii. 3, 4, 9, and goes on to say how Paul makes mention of them ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, a puzzling expression, which obliges us to put some force on the grammar, if we translate 'in all his Epistle,' or on the facts, if we translate 'in every Epistle.' The recognition of our Epistle is express in the one case, probable in the other. There are other phrases in the Ignatian letters which remind us of the Epistle to the Ephesians, of which I only mention his direction to Polycarp (*c.* 5), to exhort the brethren to love their wives, even as the Lord the Church (Eph. v. 25, 29). Polycarp's own letter refers (*c.* 12) to words of Scripture, 'Be ye angry, and sin not,' and 'Let not the sun go down on your wrath,' the former sentence being no doubt ultimately derived from Ps. iv. 5, but only found in connexion with the latter in Eph. iv. 26. Hermas more than once shows his knowledge of the text, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God' (iv. 30), (see *Mandat*, x. 1, 2). There is another topic of evidence, the full discussion of which will come later on; I refer to the fact that the First Epistle of Peter shows traces of acquaintance with the Pauline Epistles, and in particular with those to the Romans and Ephesians. This fact is recognized by Renan, who is much impressed with the evidence it offers of the early acceptance of the Epistle to the Ephesians as Paul's, and as a document of authority (*Saint Paul*, p. xxii.). Renan, being disposed to accept Peter's Epistle, but having doubts about that to the Ephesians, is rather perplexed by this fact, which proves the priority of the latter; and he suggests that it may have been Peter's secretary who turned to account his knowledge of the Epistle ascribed to Paul (*L'Antechrist*, p. vii.); but this very gratuitous suggestion does not affect the inference as to the relative date of the two Epistles. Several critics, who do not accept either Epistle, agree as to the fact of a connexion between them. If, as has been already suggested, the Epistle to the Ephesians had the character of an encyclical, it would be natural that a copy should be preserved for the use of the Church of Rome; and we should then have a simple explanation of the fact that Peter, writing at Rome, should find

there in constant use these two letters of Paul in particular—that to the Romans and to the Ephesians.

What, then, are the reasons why it is sought to reject so weighty a mass of external evidence? You will, perhaps, be surprised to hear that one of the chief is the great likeness of this Epistle to the Epistle to the Colossians. The fact of the close affinity of the two letters is indisputable,* but the explanation which Paley gave of it is perfectly satisfactory, namely, that in two letters, written about the same time on the same subject by one person to different people, it is to be expected that the same thoughts will be expressed in nearly the same words. Now the Epistle to the Ephesians is specially tied to that to the Colossians by the fact that both letters purport to have been carried by the same messenger, Tychicus, the paragraph concerning whom is nearly the same in both (Eph. vi. 21, 22;† Col. iv. 7, 8). That the letters which the Apostle wrote to be sent off by the same messenger to different Churches should be full of the same thoughts, and those thoughts frequently expressed in the same phrases, is so very natural, that instead of the mutual similarity deserving to count as an objection to the genuineness of either, this correspondence of the character of the letters, with the traditional account of the circumstances of their origin, ought to reckon as a strong confirmation of the correctness of that account.

Yet this explanation of the similarity of the two Epistles is commonly dismissed by sceptical writers with small consideration. De Wette, for instance, condemns the Epistle to the Ephesians as but a 'verbose amplification' of the Epistle to the Colossians. He says, 'Such a transcription of himself is unworthy of an Apostle, and must therefore be the work of an imitator.'‡ The idea that it is unworthy of an Apostle to repeat himself, springs from the tacit assumption that the first

* 'Out of the 155 verses contained in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 78 contain expressions identical with those in the Colossian letter' (Davidson, ii. 200).

† From the word 'also' in Eph. vi. 21, Baur inferred the priority of the Colossian letter.

‡ In like manner, Renan (*Saint Paul*, xvii.), 'Comment Paul a-t-il pu passer son temps à contrefaire un de ses ouvrages, à se répéter, à faire une lettre banale avec une lettre topique et particulière?'

of the two Epistles was a work published for general circulation (though indeed it is not uncommon to find authors repeating themselves even in such published works); but I am at a loss to see why an Apostle might not say the same things when writing to different people. No one finds any difficulty in the supposition that an Apostle might write a circular letter—that is to say, that he might send to different Churches letters couched in identical words. What greater impropriety would there be if, instead of directing a scribe to make a copy of his first letter, he dictated a second of like tenor for the use of a different Church? Nor is the case much altered if, after the second letter had been written, he found that it added so much to what had been said in the first, as to make him wish that his disciples should read both (Col. iv. 16).

Those who ascribe the two Epistles to different authors are not agreed which was the original, which the imitation. Mayerhoff, the first assailant of the Epistle to the Colossians, made the Ephesian letter the earlier, and he has found some followers. But the more general, and as I think the more plausible, opinion reverses the order. Indeed, the personal details in the Epistle to the Colossians, and its connexion with the Epistle to Philemon, have caused it to be accepted as Pauline by some who reject the Ephesian letter. But what I regard as a complete refutation of the hypothesis of imitation on either side has been made by one of the most recent of German speculators on the subject—Holtzmann.* He has made a critical comparison of the parallel passages in the two Epistles, and his result is, that the contest as to their relative priority ends in a drawn battle. He gives as examples seven passages in which he pronounces that the Ephesians is the original, and the Colossians the imitation; and seven others in which he comes to the opposite conclusion.†

---

* Holtzmann, Professor of Theology, formerly at Heidelberg, now at Strassburg. His most important work is on the Synoptic Gospels. That here cited is *Kritik der Epheser-und Kolosserbriefe*, Leipzig, 1872. He has lately published an Introduction to the New Testament.

† These are: *Priority of Ephesians*—Eph. i. 4 = Col. i. 22; Eph. i. 6, 7 = Col. i. 13, 14; Eph. iii. 3, 5, 9 = Col. i. 26, ii. 2; Eph. iii. 17, 18,

The natural conclusion from these facts would be that the similarity between the Epistles is not to be explained by conscious imitation on either side, but by identity of authorship.* The explanation, however, which Holtzmann offers is that only a certain nucleus of the Epistle to the Colossians is genuine—that a forger taking this for his guide, manufactured by its means the Epistle to the Ephesians; and then, pleased with his handiwork, proceeded to interpolate the Epistle to the Colossians with pieces taken from his own composition. And such was the success of this attempt, that not only was the forged Ephesian Epistle universally accepted as St. Paul's, but no one cared to preserve the unimproved Colossian Epistle. Holtzmann, expurgating our present Epistle to the Colossians by removing this adventitious matter, publishes what he offers as the real original Epistle. The engineer Brindley declared that the reason rivers were made, was to feed navigable canals. Some German writers seem to think that in the ancient Church apostolic documents were only valued as the possible basis of some ingenious forgery. I might seriously discuss this theory of Holtzmann's if I could find that even in his own school he had made a single convert to it.† If you study the Epistle in Lightfoot's Commentary, you will find that each of those proposed expurgations is a real mutilation of the argument; and the chief merit of Holtzmann's work is his success in showing that the theory that the Ephesian Epistle is the work of an imitator of the Colossians gives no adequate explanation of the facts.

---

iv. 16, ii. 20 = Col. i. 23, ii. 2, 7; Eph. iv. 16 = Col. ii. 19; Eph. iv. 22–24 = Col. iii. 9, 10; Eph. v. 19 = Col. iii. 16. *Priority of Colossians*—Col. i. 1, 2, = Eph. i. 1, 2; Col. i. 3–9 = Eph. i. 15–18; Col. i. 5 = Eph. i. 3, 12, 13; Col. i. 25, 29 = Eph. iii. 2, 7; Col. ii. 4–8 = Eph. iv. 17–21; Col. iv. 5 = Eph. v. 15, 16; Col. iv. 6 = Eph. iv. 29.

* The anacolutha of the Epistle to the Ephesians (compare, for instance, iii. 1, iv. 1) afford another proof that we have here, not the calm work of an imitator of another man's production, but the fervid utterances of an original writer, whom a rush of fresh thoughts occasionally carries away from what he had been about to say.

† Hilgenfeld, in his Journal for 1873, reviewing Holtzmann's book, expresses his complete dissent from his conclusions; and having complimented the author on the ability of his performance, winds up with 'Aber sollen wir in der Wissenschaft wirklich weiter kommen, so haben wir, meine ich, objectiver zu verfahren.'

I have said enough to show that no good reason for rejecting the Epistle to the Ephesians can be drawn from its likeness to the sister Epistle to the Colossians. But I think that the real cause of hostility to this letter is not this, but rather the contradiction which it offers to modern theories of early Church history. According to these, the feud between Paulinists and anti-Paulinists continued long into the second century, and it was only at this comparatively late period that there arose the conception of the 'Catholic Church' embracing Jew and Gentile on equal terms, and giving to Paul and Peter equal honour. Men have refused to believe that the book of the Acts could have been written by a companion of Paul, even ten or twenty years after that Apostle's death, because they could not think that the conciliatory school, to which this book clearly belongs, could have arisen so early. But if we accept the Epistle to the Ephesians, we must own that Paul was himself no Paulinist, as Baur understands the word. He clearly belongs to the era of the 'Catholic Church,' concerning which he has so much to say; and he even speaks of the 'holy Apostles' (iii. 5) as might one who had no cause of quarrel with the Twelve.

And certain it is that in this Epistle we read nothing of St. Paul's controversy with those who 'forbade him to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved,' nothing of his controversy with those who wished to impose on Gentile converts the yoke of circumcision. All such controversies are clearly over at the time of writing. Those whom he addressed, though Gentiles (iii. 1), have won the position of recognition as 'fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God' (ii. 19). But is there anything incredible in the supposition that Paul himself lived to see the dying out of the controversy that had once raged so violently? Controversies soon die out in the face of accomplished facts. I have myself seen many hot political controversies—about the first Reform Bill; about the abolition of the Corn Laws; about the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. As long as any practical end could be obtained, the battle raged fiercely; but when a decision was made, which there was no hope of overturning, all parties acquiesced in the inevitable, and took no interest

in wrangling over the old dispute. So it was with the dispute as to the obligation of Mosaism. When emissaries came down from Jerusalem, assuring Paul's Gentile converts that unless they were circumcised Christ should profit them nothing, and when many of these converts appeared ready to give ear to such teaching, it was natural that the Apostle should protest loudly against a doctrine which subverted the whole Gospel he had taught. But he counteracted it in even a more effectual way than direct opposition. He and his disciples went on making new converts, and founding new Churches among the Gentiles, on whom no obligation of Judaic observance was laid, until it became hopeless for the zealots for the Mosaic Law in Palestine to dream of excommunicating so large and powerful a body. Nine or ten years of Paul's preaching were enough to put the position of the Gentile Churches beyond danger of assault. No one can doubt that at the time of Paul's Roman imprisonment there were Christian Churches in Ephesus and other cities of Asia, in Greece, in Syria, in Rome itself, containing a multitude of Gentile converts, who did not observe the law of Moses, and who, nevertheless, did not doubt that they were entitled to every privilege which union with Christ conferred. Gentile Christianity was by this time an accomplished fact, and it shows inability to grasp the historic situation if a man expects Paul's letters at this date to exhibit him still employed in controversial defence of the position of his Gentile converts, or if he is surprised to find Paul taking for granted that the barrier between Jew and Gentile had been thrown down.* It is as great an anachronism to expect to find Paul, at the time of his imprisonment, maintaining the right of a Gentile to be admitted into the Christian Church without circumcision, as

* Davidson objects (ii. 213) that Paul's language in this Epistle 'suits an author who knew the widespread fruit of the Gospel among Gentiles, and witnessed its mighty effects, long after Paul had departed, but is scarcely consonant with the perpetual struggle carried on by the Apostle against a Judaizing Christianity upheld by Peter, James, and John.' But there is evidence that Paul himself knew the widespread fruit of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and witnessed its mighty effects; and there is no evidence that his struggle against Judaizing Christians was perpetual, or that Peter, James, and John, were his opponents: unless we take Baur's word rather than the Apostle's own.

it would be to expect to find a statesman of the present day dilating on the right of a Jew to be admitted into Parliament without swearing 'on the true faith of a Christian.'

But though we can see that, at the time the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, there was no need of a struggle to claim for Gentiles admission on equal terms to all the privileges of the Gospel, we can see also that this struggle was then not long over. We take it now as a matter of course that we have a full right to every Christian privilege, and we should be amazed if anyone denied our title on the ground that we are not children of Abraham, or do not observe the Mosaic Law. The writer of this Epistle asserts it as a truth that in Christ the distinction between Jew and Gentile has been done away, and that the Jew has no longer any exclusive position of pre-eminence; but to him this truth is no matter of course, but an amazing paradox. He is astonished as he contemplates this 'mystery of Christ,' which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, 'that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel' (iii. 4). He is thankful that to himself the revelation of this mystery had been made, and that by the grace of God he had been employed to publish it to the world. Cavils have been raised both against the exaggerated humility of 'less than the least of all saints' (iii. 8), which has been taken for a mere imitation of 1 Cor. xv. 9, and against the boastfulness of iii. 4, where the language, it said, is that of a disciple of Paul, who had witnessed the victory of his principal in the general recognition of Gentile Christianity. But let it be acknowledged that Paul lived to witness that victory himself, and that at the time he wrote his Gentile disciples were affected by no stigma of inferiority, and is it possible that he could be exempt from some human feelings of triumph at the greatness of the revolution which, through his means, had been brought about? That revolution he looked on as indicating no change in the Divine plans. It had been God's eternal purpose thus through Christ to adopt the Gentiles 'into his kingdom;' and it was Paul's great glory that God should have vouchsafed to choose him, unworthy though he was, to receive the

revelation of a mystery unknown to former ages, and to be made God's instrument for publishing it to the world. I am persuaded that anyone who studies the freshness and novelty with which the doctrine of the non-exclusive character of Christianity is regarded in the Epistle to the Ephesians, will feel that this is a document which cannot be pushed down to the second century.*

It has been objected that Paul could never have directed the Colossian Church to procure what was but a diffuse and vapid copy of the letter addressed to themselves. Let me point out that though the two letters deal with the same themes, one who had read either would find in the other a varied presentation of doctrine. In the Colossian Epistle the dignity of the Head of the Church is set forth with a fulness greater than in any other Pauline Epistle; in this Epistle the dignity of the Church itself has been exhibited. We are so familiar with the idea of the Catholic Church, that we cannot easily conceive how great an impression must have been made by the wonderful unlikeness of the Christian organization to anything the world had previously witnessed. In every great town throughout the empire there was now a community in which equality was the rule, and all the distinctions which had kept men apart counted for nothing. Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, were united in mutual love; the slave and the freeman had like privileges, male and female were on equal terms. There was no exclusiveness; any who desired to join was welcome. And all these several communities were but parts of one wider organization. Distance of place counted as little as difference of social condition. All were brethren in a common faith: eager to do good offices to each other because bound by love to a common Lord, whose glorious reappearing was the common hope of all. The Christian Church impressed the imaginations of men, whose own claim to belong to it was not admitted. According to Valentinus the Church on earth was but the visible presentation of a heavenly Aeon which had existed before all time. And in

* I have noted (p. 31) the Pauline trait that the writer (ii. 11) feels it an affront that the name 'uncircumcised' should be applied to his Gentile disciples.

this Valentinus agreed with what I count to be older heresies (Iren. I. xxx. 1, Hippol. v. 6). Let no one say that it needed a century before such a phenomenon as this could arrest the attention or impress the imagination of men. The phenomenon existed in Paul's time. The unity of the Church was manifested when so many congregations of his converts made collections for the poor saints at Jerusalem; when his disciples sent money for his own support to distant cities; when as he drew near to Rome brethren came as far as Appii Forum to meet him. His remaining letters (and he probably wrote many more) testify how many different communities claimed his care. Paul's earlier Epistles, especially those to the Corinthians, show that his mind had dwelt on the fact that Christians formed an organized body, which he describes as the temple of the living God; as a body of which each particular saint was a member, Christ the head. These figures are repeated in the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 23, ii. 20, iii. 6, iv. 16, 25), but he adds a new one.* The closest tie of earthly love is used to illustrate the love of Christ for His Church; and then, by a wonderful reflection of the illustration, the love of Christ for His Church is made to sanctify and glorify Christian marriage, husbands being exhorted to love their wives, even as Christ the Church.

You will find some critics using very disparaging terms as to the literary excellence of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Questions of taste cannot be settled by disputation, but a critic may well distrust his own judgment if he can see no merit in a book which has had a great success; and I do not think that there is any N. T. book which we can prove to have been earlier circulated than this, or more widely esteemed. At the present day there is no more popular hymn than that† which but turns into verse the words of this Epistle; and holding the opinion I have already expressed as to the probability of the Apostle John's having visited Rome, I cannot but think that when he beheld in apocalyptic vision the 'new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband' (Rev. xxi. 2; see also xix. 7;

* Yet see 2 Cor. xi. 2; and Is. liv. 5, lxi. 10; Jer. iii. 14.
† 'The Church's one Foundation.'

xxi. 9; xxii. 17), he only saw the embodiment of a conception familiar to him from his knowledge of an Epistle highly valued by the Roman Church.* I very strongly believe that it was the language (Eph. i. 4) about the election of the Church before the foundation of the world which was the source not only of the Ophite and Valentinian conceptions to which I have just referred, but also of the language employed by early orthodox writers. Hermas (*Vis.* ii. 4) speaks of the Church as created before all things, and of the world as formed for her sake; and the so-called second Epistle of Clement of Rome (*c.* 14) speaks of the spiritual Church as created before the sun and moon, as pre-existent like Christ Himself, and like Him manifested in the last days for man's salvation. It is idle to discuss the literary excellence of the Epistle to the Ephesians, if I am right in thinking that it has had so great influence on Christian thought.

IV. *The Pastoral Epistles.*—I now come to the group of Pauline Epistles against which the charge of spuriousness has been made most confidently. Renan, who does not venture positively to condemn any of the others, and who has only serious doubts about the Epistle to the Ephesians, seems to have thought that his reputation for orthodoxy in his own school would be seriously compromised if he showed any hesitation in rejecting the Pastoral Epistles; and, accordingly, 'apocryphal,' 'fabricated,' 'forged,' are the epithets which he commonly applies to them. Yet, not very consistently, he constantly uses them as authorities for his narrative.† Yet it

* According to modern sceptical writers the author of the Apocalypse was an enemy and a libeller of St. Paul; but the real St. John read and valued St. Paul's writings. For if the Epistle to the Colossians be really Paul's, it scarcely needs the quotation of particular phrases to show that the Christology of that Epistle is reproduced in the Apocalypse; but we have the very phrases πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Col. i. 18) in Rev. i. 5, and the ἀρχή of the same verse, with πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), in ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. iii. 14). The writing of the names of the Apostles on the foundations of the heavenly city (Rev. xxi. 14) had been anticipated in Eph. iii. 20; and there is a close resemblance between Eph. iii. 5, and Rev. x. 7. There are very many other verbal coincidences which quite fall in with the supposition of St. John's acquaintance with the Epistle to the Ephesians, though they would not suffice to prove it.

† See *Saint Paul*, 124, 132, 419, 439, but especially *L'Antechrist*, pp. 100, 101, which are altogether founded on these Epistles. At p. 103 he

is certainly for no deficiency of external attestation that these Epistles are to be rejected. Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, the Muratorian Fragment, Theophilus of Antioch, the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, unquestionably recognize them. Polycarp, at the very beginning of the second century, uses then largely, and there are what I count distinct echoes of the letters in Clement of Rome,* and in Justin Martyr. I must speak in a little more detail about Hegesippus.

Baur has given students of early Church History so many new ideas, that they would have great cause to be grateful to him, if it were not that these ideas are for the most part wrong. I admire the ingenuity of Baur, as I admire the genius of Victor Hugo. But I think *L'Homme qui rit* gives as accurate a representation of English History in the reign of James II. as Baur does of the early Christian Church. I do not know any of Baur's suggestions wilder than that about Hegesippus and the Pastoral Epistles. I have already (see p. 422) referred to a place in which Eusebius in his own words gives the sense of a passage in Hegesippus employing there the words, 'knowledge, falsely so called.' Baur thinks that Eusebius found these words in Hegesippus; and though this cannot be proved, I think it very likely; for we constantly find that where Eusebius, instead of transcribing a passage, gives a summary of it, he is apt, as is very natural, to incorporate many of his author's words. It seems likely, then, that Hegesippus is to be added to the number of those who use the Pastoral Epistles. But instead of drawing this conclusion, Baur infers that the Pastoral Epistles use Hegesippus; a frightful anachronism, in which few of his disciples at the present day venture to follow him; because, whether the Pastoral Epistles be Paul's or not, both external

---

feels the necessity of making an apology, and says, 'Nous usons de cette épître comme d'une sorte de roman historique, fait avec un sentiment très-juste de la situation de Paul en ses derniers temps.' There could not be clearer testimony from an unwilling witness to the internal marks of truth presented by the Epistle which he cites.

* In addition to several in the previously known portions, see the newly recovered chapter lxi., in particular the phrase ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων (1 Tim. i. 17).

and internal evidence forbid our ascribing to them so late a date as the end of the second century. Baur has no better reason for his opinion than that Hegesippus, being an anti-Pauline Ebionite, *could* not quote St. Paul. But for so describing Hegesippus there is no evidence. He was a native of Palestine, no doubt; but Eusebius, who was certainly no Ebionite, has no suspicion of his orthodoxy. Hegesippus approved of the Epistle of the Roman Clement, which has a strong Pauline colouring, and he was in full communion both with the Church of Rome and with other leading Churches of his time.

The only set-off to be made against the proof of the universal reception of the Pastoral Epistles by orthodox Christians is the fact of their rejection by some heretics. For the other Pauline Epistles we have the testimony of Marcion; but these three were not included in his Canon. We hear also of Basilides having rejected them. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 11) attributes this rejection solely to doctrinal dislike, naming in particular the verse about ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, just referred to, as the cause of offence. St. Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Titus, also complains of the arbitrary conduct of these heretics in rejecting Epistles which they did not like, without being able to produce good reasons to justify their rejection; and he says that Tatian, though he rejected some of Paul's Epistles, yet accepted that to Titus with particular cordiality. From this it has been commonly imagined that the Epistles which Tatian rejected were those to Timothy. There is no evidence to prove this, but the thing is likely enough. At least the First Epistle to Timothy contains matter offensive to an Encratite, in its condemnation of those who forbade to marry and commanded to abstain from meat, and in its advice to Timothy to drink a little wine for his stomach's sake. Yet the First Epistle to Timothy and that to Titus so clearly stand or fall together, that to accept the one and reject the other is a decision which commands no respect. The same traits which would make an Epistle disliked by Tatian would make it also disliked by Marcion, who shared his Encratite principles; and Marcion was so very arbitrary in his dealings with the Gospels, that his rejection of Epistles

does not count for much, especially when these Epistles have the earlier attestation of Polycarp.

If, therefore, the battle had to be fought solely on the ground of external evidence, the Pastoral Epistles would obtain a complete victory. The objections to these Epistles on the grounds of internal evidence may be classed under three heads; and the facts on which these objections are founded must be conceded, though we dispute the inferences drawn from them.*

(1) There are peculiarities of diction which unite these Epistles to each other, and separate them from the other Pauline letters. For instance, all three open with the salutation, 'Grace, mercy, and peace;' in the other Pauline letters it is 'Grace and peace.' The phrase 'sound doctrine' διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα, and other derivatives from ὑγίης in this metaphorical sense, are to be found repeatedly in the Pastoral Epistles, and not elsewhere. So, likewise, the word εὐσέβεια, and the phrase, 'this is a faithful saying.' The master of a slave is called δεσπότης in these Epistles, κύριος in the others. The appearance of our Lord at His second coming is ἐπιφάνεια, not παρουσία, as in the earlier Epistles. Several other examples of the same kind might be given, but these are enough to illustrate the nature of the argument. The inference which sceptical writers draw from it is, that these three Epistles have a common author, and that author not St. Paul.

(2) The second topic is, that the nature of the controversies with which the writer has to deal, and the opponents whom he has to encounter, are different from those dealt with in Paul's other Epistles. The writer does not insist on the worthlessness of circumcision and other Mosaic rites, on the importance of faith, or on the doctrine of justification without the deeds of the law. On the other hand, he insists more sharply than in the other Epistles on the necessity of good works. For the false teachers whom he had in view appear to have prided themselves on their knowledge, and the word Gnosis seems to have then already acquired a technical sense. But this boasted knowledge consisted merely in acquaintance

* In what follows I repeat several things which I said in an article on the Pastoral Epistles in the *Christian Observer* for 1877.

with unprofitable speculations about endless genealogies, which only ministered questions; while they who possessed it neglected the practical side of religion, confessing God with their mouths, but in works denying Him, 'being abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.' In opposition to such teaching, the writer insists sharply on the necessity that those who have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works, should avoid foolish and unlearned questions and genealogies, and contentions and strivings about the law, inasmuch as these are unprofitable and vain. The false teaching combated seems to differ a good deal in complexion from that opposed in the Epistle to the Colossians, and to have a more Jewish cast (Titus i. 14). It has also been contended that the directions to Christian ministers in 1 Tim. and Titus imply a more developed hierarchical system than do Paul's acknowledged letters. These common characteristics of the Pastoral Epistles lead us to believe that they were written at a later time than Paul's other Epistles, and when the perils of the Church were different. The use, concerning the false teachers, of the word heretic (Titus iii. 10), has also been noted as a sign of lateness; but it must be remembered that 'heresies' are enumerated among the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 20).

(3) There is great difficulty in harmonizing these Epistles with the history in the Acts. The Epistle to Titus implies a voyage of Paul to Crete; the First Epistle to Timothy implies other travels of Paul, for which we cannot easily find room in Luke's history. Take, in particular, the Second Epistle. This was written from an imprisonment in Rome; for we are told (i. 17) how Onesiphorus, when in Rome, searched diligently for the Apostle, and found him. And on his way to Rome we are told (iv. 20) that the Apostle left Trophimus at Miletus, sick. Now, when Paul was last at Miletus, on his way to Jerusalem, he did not leave Trophimus there; for we find that Trophimus accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, and that one of the causes why the Jews of Asia set on Paul in the Temple was that they had seen this Trophimus with him in the city, and supposed that the Apostle had brought him into the Temple (Acts xxi. 29). St. Paul's voyage from Cæsarea

to Rome is carefully traced by St. Luke, and we find that he did not touch at Miletus on his way. I will not trouble you with some far-fetched attempts to reconcile this statement about Trophimus with the supposition that the imprisonment from which the Second Epistle to Timothy was written is the same as that recorded by St. Luke. In my judgment these explanations utterly fail. Further, we are told in the verse just referred to that 'Erastus abode in Corinth;' and the most natural explanation of this is that Paul had left him there; but we find from the Acts that the Apostle had not been in Corinth for some years before his Roman imprisonment, and Timothy had been with Paul since his last visit to Corinth, so that there was no occasion to inform him by letter about it. Once more, the verse about the cloak, or, as some translate it, the case for books, that Paul left at Troas (a verse, I may say in passing, which no forger would ever dream of inserting), would imply that Paul had been at Troas within some moderate time of the epoch when the Apostle was writing, for it is hardly likely he would have left articles on which he seems to have set much value to lie uncalled for at Troas for many years. But the last visit to Troas recorded in the Acts is distant some seven or eight years from the date of the Roman imprisonment. Other proofs of the same kind could be multiplied.

Now, of these three difficulties, the first, arising from peculiarities of diction, is one which we have already learned to disregard. The Epistles which I have previously examined exhibit in Paul's writings very great varieties of expression, showing him to be a man of considerable mental pliability, and not one whose stock of phrases would be likely to be stereotyped when he came to write these letters. But I willingly concede that the argument from the diction makes it likely that the Pastoral Epistles were written at no great distance of time from each other, and probably at some distance of time from the other Epistles. For in Paul's Epistles we find great likeness of expression between Epistles written at nearly the same time—as, for instance, between the Romans and Galatians—between the Ephesians and Colossians, while the different groups of Epistles differ considerably in words

and topics from each other. This is what we find on examining the different works of any author who has written much, viz. considerable resemblance in style between works of the same period; but often modifications of style as he advances in life. Now, though each group of Paul's Epistles has its peculiarities of diction, there are links of connexion between the phraseology of each group and that of the next in order of time; and there are such links between that of the Pastoral Epistles and of the letters of the imprisonment. Thus the Pastoral Epistles are said to be un-Pauline, because they call the enemy of mankind 'the devil,' and not 'Satan,' as Paul does. But the name 'the devil' occurs twice in Ephesians (iv. 27, vi. 11). The name ἐπιφάνεια, applied to our Lord's second coming, is said to be un-Pauline; but is found in 2 Thess. ii. 8 (see also the φανεροῦν of Col. iii. 4). The οἰκονομία of the Ephesian Epistle (i. 10, ii. 2, 9) reappears in the most approved reading of 1 Tim. i. 4. The co-ordination of love and faith, in Eph. vi. 23, is said by Davidson (ii. 214) to be un-Pauline, but to be found also in 1 Timothy. And so it certainly is (i. 14, iv. 12, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 22); but I should not have dreamed of building an argument on what seems to me one of the most common of Pauline combinations; for instance, 'the breastplate of faith and love' (1 Thess. v. 8). The stress laid in the Pastoral Epistles on coming to 'the knowledge of the truth,' εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας (1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7; Tit. i. 1) has been imagined to indicate a time after Gnostic ideas as to the importance of knowledge had become prevalent; but the term ἐπίγνωσις is frequent in Paul's Epistles (see in particular Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 9, 10, ii. 2, iii. 10). Dr. Gwynn (*Speaker's Commentary* 'On Philippians,' p. 588) has noted several coincidences between 2 Tim. iv. 6–8, and Philippians; in particular, the use of the three words σπένδομαι, ἀνάλυσις, ἀγών, the first two words being in the N. T. peculiar to these two Epistles, and the third being also in the N. T. a rare and exclusively Pauline word. On the whole, there is nothing in the diction of these Epistles which is not explained by the supposition that these three are the latest of St. Paul's Epistles, and that they were written at no great distance of time from each other.

We are led to the same conclusion on trying to harmonize these Epistles with the Acts. I have already mentioned the difficulties attending the supposition that the Second to Timothy was written from the imprisonment recorded in the Acts. The other two Epistles present equal difficulties. The First to Timothy intimates that Paul had been in Ephesus not long before; for it begins by saying, 'As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.' But on Paul's first visit to Ephesus mentioned in the Acts, he left it, not for Macedonia but for Jerusalem. On his second visit he did leave it for Macedonia; but instead of leaving Timothy behind, he sent him on before. It has been said that Paul's three years spent at Ephesus did not exclude occasional absences, and that in one of these he had gone to Macedonia—a journey imagined for the sake of this Epistle. Yet the whole tone of the Epistle implies that it was not written during a temporary absence, but that Timothy had been left in charge of the Church at Ephesus for a considerable time. When, further, it is proposed to take out of Paul's three years at Ephesus time for a journey to Crete, in which to leave Titus there, and a winter at Nicopolis spoken of in that Epistle, so large a gap is made in the three years at Ephesus that Luke's silence becomes inexplicable. Renan spends some twenty pages in proving satisfactorily enough the failure of all existing attempts to find a place for these Epistles in the period of Paul's life embraced by the Acts; but he passes over almost in silence the solution which removes every difficulty: that Paul was released from his Roman imprisonment, that he afterwards made other journeys, and wrote the Epistle to Titus and the First to Timothy, and was then imprisoned a second time, and wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy. The distance of time which, according to this solution, separates these Epistles from the rest, at once accounts for the peculiarities on which I have already commented.

What is said in answer to this is, that Paul's release from his Roman imprisonment is unhistorical—that it is a mere hypothesis invented to get rid of a difficulty. But this answer exhibits a complete misconception of the logical position; for it is really those who refuse to entertain the idea of Paul's

release who make an unwarrantable hypothesis. Paul's release from his Roman imprisonment, we are told, is unhistorical: so is his non-release. In other words, Luke's history of the life of Paul breaks off without telling us whether he was released or not. Under these circumstances a scientific inquirer ought to hold his mind unbiassed towards either supposition. If new evidence presents itself, no good reason either for accepting or rejecting it can be furnished by any preconceived opinion as to the issue of Paul's imprisonment. Now the Pastoral Epistles are a new source of evidence. They come to us with the best possible external attestation; and our opponents will not dispute that if we accept them as Pauline, they lead us to the conclusion that Paul lived to make other journeys than those recorded by St. Luke. We accept this conclusion, not because of any preconceived hypothesis, but because on other grounds we hold the Epistles to be genuine. But it is those who say, 'we cannot believe these Epistles to be Paul's, because they indicate a release from his imprisonment which we know did not take place,' who really make an unwarrantable assumption.

I am compelled to elaborate a point which seems to me too plain to need much argument, by the confidence with which a whole host of Rationalist critics assume that the Pastoral Epistles can only be received on condition of our being able to find a place for them within the limits of the history recorded in the Acts. Reuss, for instance, who gives a candid reception to the claims of the Second Epistle to Timothy, for which he thinks he can find a place within these limits, rejects the First Epistle and that to Titus, because he cannot force them in. Let us take, then, the argument about the Epistle to Titus, and it will be seen whether it is the acceptors or the rejectors of that Epistle who make an unproved hypothesis. We accept the Epistle because of the good external evidence on which it comes; and we then draw the inference, Paul at some time visited Crete. Not that we had had any previous theory on the subject, but solely because this Epistle—which we consider we have good reason to regard as Paul's—states that he did. Nay, reply our opponents, the Epistle cannot be Paul's, because he never visited Crete. 'How

do you know he did not?' 'Because we have in the Acts of the Apostles a full history of the Apostle's life, which leaves no room for such a visit.' 'Well, we are pleased to see you attribute such value to the Acts of the Apostles, as a record of Paul's life not only accurate but complete. But the history of the Acts breaks off at the year 63. May not Paul have visited Crete later?' 'No; he could not have done so, for he never was released from his Roman imprisonment.' 'But how do you know he was not?'

Which of us now is making an unproved assumption?

If we were arguing against a disciple of Darwin, and if we contended that the Darwinian theory could not be true because the six thousand years for which the world has lasted does not afford room for the changes of species which that theory asserts, would he not have a right to call on us for proof that the world has only lasted so long? Might he not smile at us if we declared that it was he who was making an unproved assumption, in asserting the possibility that the world might be older? So, in like manner, those who assert that the Pastoral Epistles cannot be Paul's, because there is no room for them in that part of his life which is recorded by St. Luke, are bound to give proof that this is the whole of his active life.

If the Pastoral Epistles did not exist, and if we were left to independent speculation as to the issue of the Apostle's imprisonment, we should conclude that the supposition of his release was more probable than the contrary. We learn from the conclusion of the Acts that the Jews at Rome had not been commissioned to oppose his appeal; and since, until the burning of Rome in 64, the Imperial authorities had no motive for persecuting Christians as such, we should expect that the case against Paul, stated in such a letter as the procurator was likely to send (Acts xxv. 25, xxvi. 32), would end in such a dismissal as that given by Gallio. And this was Paul's own expectation both when he wrote to the Philippians (Phil. i. 25, 26; ii. 24) and to Philemon (*v.* 22). Possibly we have the Apostle's own assertion of his release as an actual fact. At least, when later he is looking forward to a trial, with no sanguine anticipations as to its issue, he

calls to mind (2 Tim. iv. 16) a former hearing, when, though earthly friends deserted him, the Lord stood by him, and he was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. St. Chrysostom (*in loc.*) understands 'the lion' here of Nero, and the verse as intimating that Paul's trial ended in an acquittal.

However this may be, certain it is that there was in the early Church a tradition of St. Paul's release, quite independent of the Pastoral Epistles. I have quoted (p. 49) the passage in the Muratorian Fragment which speaks of Paul's journey to Spain, a statement which assumes his release from imprisonment; and it is at least probable that Clement of Rome also recognizes the journey to Spain, when he speaks (*c.* 5) of Paul's having gone to the extremity of the West. On this evidence Renan accepts the fact of Paul's release (*L'Antechrist*, p. 106); only he will not let it count anything in favour of the Pastoral Epistles, believing that the Apostle on his release went, according to the evidence just cited, to the West, and not, as these Epistles imply, to Asia Minor. For myself, I should think it less probable that the Apostle carried out the earlier intention expressed in the Epistle to the Romans than the later one expressed in the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. But it is not impossible that he might have done both. The evidence is too slender to warrant any positive assertion as to the Apostle's movements: and we appreciate more highly the obligations we owe to the Acts of the Apostles when we find how much in the dark we are as to St. Paul's history as soon as that book no longer guides us. My object has been merely to show that those who assert that St. Paul was not released from his Roman imprisonment assert not only what they cannot prove, but what is less probable than the contrary. And when once the possibility is admitted of Apostolic labours of St. Paul later than those recorded in the Acts, all the objections that have been urged against the acceptance of the Pastoral Epistles immediately lose their weight.

Two objections to the late date which I have assigned to these Epistles deserve to be noticed. One is that Paul, writing to Timothy, says, 'Let no man despise thy youth' (1 Tim. iv. 12); whereas many years must have elapsed be-

tween the time at which we first hear of Timothy in the Acts, and the date which I have assigned to these Epistles. But when we consider the office in which Timothy was placed over Elders, with power to ordain them and rebuke; and when we reflect that the name of Elder must, in its first application, have been given to men advanced in age (certainly I suppose not younger than forty-three, the legal age for a consulship at Rome), we shall see that even if Timothy were at the time as old as thirty or thirty-five, there would still be reason to fear lest those placed under his government should despise his youth. The other objection is that the First Epistle to Timothy was evidently written after a recent visit of Paul to Ephesus; and if we suppose this visit to have taken place after the Roman imprisonment, we appear to contradict what Paul said at Miletus to the Ephesian Elders, 'I know that ye all among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God shall see my face no more' (Acts xx. 25). Our first impression certainly is that these words imply prophetic assurance; yet when we look at the rest of this speech we find the Apostle disclaiming any detailed knowledge of the future, 'I go unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there,' save that he had this general knowledge that the Holy Ghost witnessed in every city, saying, bonds and afflictions abide him. If we are entitled thus to press the force of οἶδα, we might assert confidently that the Apostle was released from his Roman imprisonment, for he writes to the Philippians (i. 25), '*I know* that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith, that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again.' A little before, however, in the same chapter, 'I know' in one verse (19) is modified by 'according to my earnest expectation and my hope' in the next: and when Paul says to Agrippa, 'Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest,' I suppose he is not speaking of supernatural certain knowledge of Agrippa's heart, but merely of the strong persuasion which he entertained concerning the king's belief. Thus, we see that, whatever our first impression might have been, the Apostle's mode of speaking elsewhere quite permits us to

understand that, in Acts xx. he is not speaking prophetically, but only expressing a strong belief, founded on grounds of human probability, viz. his knowledge of the persecutions which certainly awaited him, and his intended journeys to Rome and Spain, which were likely to take him far away from Ephesus.

Renan, as you may believe, makes no difficulty in conceding that Paul when he spoke at Miletus had no infallible knowledge of the future. But that, he says, is not the question. 'It is no matter to us whether or not Paul pronounced these words. But the author of the Acts knew well the sequel of the life of Paul, though unhappily he has not thought proper to tell us of it. And it is impossible that he should have put into the mouth of his master a prediction which he well knew was not verified.' I so far agree with Renan that I think it likely that if the author of the Acts had known of a subsequent return of Paul to Ephesus, he would have given some intimation of it in this place. But this only yields another argument in favour of the position in defence of which I have already contended, viz. that the book of the Acts was written not long after the date to which it brings the history, viz. the end of Paul's two years' residence in Rome.

It were, perhaps, enough to show that the objections break down which have been made to receiving the external testimony in favour of the Pastoral Epistles; but in the case of one at least of these Epistles, the Second to Timothy, the internal marks of Pauline origin are so strong, that I do not think any Epistle can with more confidence be asserted to be the Apostle's work. To the truth of this the assailants of the Epistle bear unwilling testimony. There are passages in the Epistle which cling so closely to Paul that it is only by tearing the letter to pieces that any part can be dissociated from that Apostle. Thus, of those who reject the Epistle, Weisse, Hausrath, Pfleiderer, and Ewald, recognize the section iv. 9–22, or the greater part of it, as a fragment of a genuine Pauline letter; and to this view Davidson gives some kind of hesitating assent. Hausrath, Pfleiderer, and Ewald further own the section i. 15–18.

To my mind there cannot be a more improbable hypo-

thesis than that of genuine letters of Paul being used only for the purpose of cutting patches out of them to sew on to forged Epistles, while the fragments left behind are thrown away and never heard of again. You will observe, too, that in this case the parts of the Second Epistle to Timothy which are owned as genuine are just those filled with names and personal details, in which a forger would have been most likely to make a slip. It is tantamount to a confession of defeat to surrender as indefensible all that part of the case which admits of being tested, and maintain that part only with respect to which prejudices and subjective fancies do not admit of being checked. Just imagine that the case had been the other way. If we were forced to own that the passages which dealt with personal details were spurious, with what face could we maintain the rest of the Epistle to be genuine?

If we test the remaining part of the Epistle we shall find the genuine Pauline ring all through. Let us note first the exordium of the Epistle. The writer commences by thanking God for the unfeigned faith which is in Timothy, and tells him that without ceasing he has remembrance of him in his prayers night and day. Now, take Paul's ten other letters, and eight of them commence with thanking God for what he has heard or knows of the religious progress of those whom he addresses. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is scarcely an exception, for that too begins with thanksgiving. The only clear exception is the Epistle to the Galatians, which is a letter of sharp reproof. None of the other New Testament Epistles resembles Paul's in this peculiarity. Of the eight Epistles which begin with thanksgiving, seven also have in the same connexion the mention of Paul's continual prayer for his converts. It is characteristic of St. Paul, that even when writing to Churches with which he has in many respects occasion to find fault, he always begins by fixing his thoughts on what there was in those persons deserving of praise, and by calling to mind his constant prayer to God on their behalf. Yet this characteristic of St. Paul is by no means obtrusive in his writings; very few have noticed it. You can answer each for yourselves, whether, if you had been

desired to write an Epistle in St. Paul's style, it would have occurred to you in what way you must begin. Strange that this characteristic should have been observed by an imitator so careless as to be unable to copy accurately the salutation, 'Grace and peace,' with which Paul's Epistles begin! The most plausible argument I can think of putting into the mouth of anyone who still maintains this Epistle to be non-Pauline, is that the forger has taken for his model the Epistle to the Romans, which begins in precisely the same way. Nay, there is a further coincidence, for the next topic is also in both Epistles the same, namely, that there was no reason for being ashamed of the Gospel of Christ before the face of the hostile or unbelieving world. But the hypothesis of conscious imitation is in various ways excluded. In the first place, the mode of commencement is different in the other Epistle to Timothy and in that to Titus; so that the forger, if forger there was, must have stumbled on this note of genuineness by accident, and without himself knowing the value of it. And, secondly, so far from there being the close imitation of the Epistle to the Romans which the hypothesis assumes, the writer completely abandons that Epistle and its leading ideas, the controversy concerning faith and justification being wholly absent from the Pastoral Epistles. And more generally, there is a freeness of handling utterly unlike the slavishness of an imitator; while the ideas introduced seem naturally to rise from the circumstances of the writer, and not to have been borrowed from anyone else.

I would in the next place call your attention to the abundance of details concerning individuals given in these Epistles. A forger would take refuge in generalities, and put into the mouth of the Apostle the doctrinal teaching for which he desired to claim his sanction, without running the risk of exposing himself to detection by undertaking to give the history of Paul's companions, of which he must be supposed to know little or nothing. On the contrary, with the exception of the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, there is no part of the New Testament so rich in personal details as these Epistles. Twenty-three members of the Apostolic Church are mentioned in the Second Epistle to

Timothy. And these are neither exclusively names to be found elsewhere, in which case it might have been said that they had been derived from the genuine writings; nor all new names, in which case it might be said that the forger had guarded himself by avoiding the names of real persons, and only speaking of persons invented by himself; but, just as might have been expected in a real letter, some ten persons are mentioned of whom we read in the other scanty records of the same time which have descended to us, the remaining names being new to us.

In the case of the old names new details are confidently supplied. Thus we have in the Epistle to the Colossians, 'Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas greet you;' in that to Philemon, 'There salute thee Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers.' Now note the treatment of these four names in the Second Epistle to Timothy. There we read, 'Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world. Only Luke is with me.' If this was forgery, what a wonderful man the forger must have been so to realize the personality of Paul's attendants, as to undertake to give their history subsequent to the time covered by the authentic records, and to put a note of disgrace on one who, as far as the genuine Epistles went, had been honourably recognized as Paul's fellow-labourer! The Second Epistle to Timothy has also to tell of Marcus. He is supposed not to have been at the time with Paul, but is commended as useful to him in the ministry. If a forger had wished to represent one of Paul's companions as failing him in his hour of trial, he would surely have selected not Demas but Marcus, who is probably the same as he whose previous desertion of Paul caused the rupture between him and Barnabas. Lastly, of Aristarchus the Pastoral Epistles have not a word to tell, although his name ought to have come in in that enumeration of his attendants which the Apostle makes in accounting for his being left alone. The true explanation probably is that Aristarchus was dead at the time. But if it was a forgery, how is it that the forger, who can so courageously give the history of Paul's other attendants, fails in his heart when he comes to speak of Aristarchus? We may also comment on

the clause 'Titus to Dalmatia.' Surely, if it were forgery, the forger would have been consistent, and sent Titus to Crete. It is a note of genuineness when a document contains an apparent contradiction which is not real; for forgers do not needlessly throw stumbling-blocks in their readers' way. Now the statement, 'Only Luke is with me' (iv. 11), seems inconsistent with the list of salutations (*v.* 21). But we see in a moment that the former verse does not mean that, save for Luke, the Apostle was friendless at Rome, but only that the company of personal attendants who travelled about with him had all been scattered, leaving only Luke behind. Now if we had been left to form our own conjectures we should have imagined that Paul, brought a prisoner to Rome, would have been completely dependent on the society and support of the Christians of the Church which he might find there. We should hardly have thought of him as this Epistle exhibits him, as if he had made this missionary journey of his own choice, surrounded by his little band of deacons, sending them on his missions, and feeling himself almost deserted when he has but one of his retinue in attendance on him. This state of things, not consciously disclosed in the Epistle but revealed in the most incidental way, could never have been taken for granted in this manner except by one who lived so close to the Apostle's time as to have perfect cognizance of the conditions in which he lived at Rome.

Of the members of the Roman Church whom he mentions, one is certainly a real person, Linus, whom very early tradition asserts to have been the first bishop of the Church of Rome. The Roman Church to this day, and we have reason to think that the practice is at least as old as the second century, commemorates in her Eucharistic service the names of Linus, Cletus, Clemens. These are commonly supposed to have been, after the Apostles, the first bishops of Rome (see Irenæus, iii. 3), and, by the confession of everyone, were leading men in that Church in the latter part of the first century. Clement, in particular, became the hero of a number of legends, and was believed to have been an immediate disciple of the Apostles. Yet neither the name of Cletus nor of Clement appears in this list which, if the work were a

forgery, we must therefore suppose to have been anterior to their acquiring celebrity. Linus does appear, but in quite a subordinate position—'Eubulus, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren.' If the letter is genuine, it is quite intelligible that Linus, who at the time the Epistle was written was a leading disciple, though not then the principal one, might have held the chief place in the government of the Church after the Apostle's death; but if the letter was composed after he had held that place, we may be sure there would have been some stronger intimation of his prominence here. Two other persons mentioned in the same connexion are possibly persons of whom we read elsewhere. One of Martial's epigrams relates to a marriage between Pudens and Claudia, and a very ingenious case has been made by putting together the notices in Martial and Tacitus to show that this Claudia was a British maiden and a Christian. The close contact of the two names in the Epistle is striking, but I cannot pronounce it more than a curious coincidence. One more personal reference I will direct your attention to—the twice-repeated mention of the household of Onesiphorus. You know, or will know, the controversial use that has been made of this passage. But from the salutation being to the household of Onesiphorus, not to Onesiphorus himself, we may reasonably conclude that Onesiphorus was either dead, or at least known to the Apostle not to be with his household at the time this letter is written. There is no difficulty about this if all be real history. But that a forger should have invented such a refinement, yet in no way have called attention to it, is utterly incredible.

I could add many more arguments; but the impression left on my mind is that there is no Epistle which we can with more confidence assert to be Paul's than the Second to Timothy. When this is established, the judgment we form of the other two Pastoral Epistles is greatly influenced. If these two had come by themselves, the way in which both begin would excite suspicion. They do not open as do Paul's other Epistles, but commence by telling that Paul had left Timothy at Ephesus, Titus in Crete. This is information which his correspondents would not require; and we are

reminded of the ordinary commencement of a Greek play in which information is given, not for the benefit of any personage on the stage, but for that of the audience. Yet as we proceed, our suspicions are not confirmed ; and we must own that there is no reason why St. Paul should not begin a letter to a disciple by reminding him of the commission he had entrusted him with. Critics of all schools agree that the three Pastoral Epistles have such marks of common authorship that all must stand or fall together. The three topics of objection which I have mentioned as urged against the Pastoral Epistles turn, when any one of the Epistles is acknowledged, into arguments in favour of the other two. We cannot say, for instance, that the diction is un-Pauline, when there is the strongest possible resemblance to the diction of an Epistle which we own to be Paul's. The admission of the second Epistle forces us to believe that Paul was released from his Roman imprisonment, and then all the marks of time in the other two Epistles fit in with the late date which we are thus able to assign to them. I see nothing in the development indicated of Church organization which is inconsistent with the period we assign to these letters. That Paul, who addressed the bishops and deacons of the Philippian Church (Phil. i. 1 ; see also Acts xx. 28), should give directions for the choice of such officers is only natural. If it were true that these Epistles intimated that there was only one ἐπίσκοπος in each Church, I should have no difficulty in believing it on their evidence. But in my opinion this is more than we are warranted in inferring from the use of the singular number in 1 Tim. iii. 2 ; Tit. i. 7. The omission to say anything about deacons in the latter Epistle is more like what would occur in a real letter than in the work of a forger. It is not easy to see when the forger could have lived, or with what object he could have written ; or why, after having succeeded in gaining acceptance for one of the Epistles, he should hazard detection by writing a second, which seems to add very little.

As for the general Pauline character of these letters, there cannot be a better witness than Renan, who, while still continuing to assert them not to be genuine, every now and then seems staggered by the proofs of authenticity that strike him

He says, in one place, 'Some passages of these letters are so beautiful that we cannot help asking if the forger had not in his hands some authentic notes of Paul, which he has incorporated in his apocryphal composition' (*L'Église Chrétienne*, p. 95). And he sums up (p. 104): 'What runs through the whole is admirable practical good sense. The ardent pietist who composed these letters never wanders for a moment in the dangerous paths of quietism. He repeats that the woman must not devote herself to the spiritual life if she has family duties to fulfil: that the principal duty of woman is to bring up children: that it is an error for anyone to pretend to serve the Church if he has not all duly ordered in his own household. The piety our author inculcates is altogether spiritual. Bodily practices, such as abstinence, count with him for little. You can feel the influence of St. Paul: a sort of sobriety in mysticism; and amid the strangest excesses of faith in the supernatural, a great bottom of rectitude and sincerity.'

XXI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IN the controversies concerning the books which I have already discussed, we had usually the deniers of the supernatural ranged on one side, and those who acknowledge a Divine revelation on the other. There is no such division of parties in the controversies concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, which may be described as being more important from a literary than from an evidential point of view. On the main point in dispute, whether or not St. Paul was the author, there was, as we shall presently see, difference of opinion in the early Church. At the time of the Reformation, Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin, agreed in holding that St. Paul was not the author; and at the present day this is the opinion of a number of divines whose orthodoxy cannot be impeached. On the other hand, critics of the sceptical school do not dispute the antiquity of this Epistle, nor the consideration it has always enjoyed in the Church. The general opinion is that it was written while the Temple was still standing, that is to say, before the destruction of Jerusalem. In Hilgenfeld's *Introduction* it is placed immediately after the Epistle to the Philippians, and before any of the Gospels, or the Acts, before the Apocalypse, and before 2 Thess., Colossians, and Ephesians, which he does not own as Paul's, as also before the First Epistle of Peter. Davidson agrees with him in this arrangement. We have indisputable evidence to the antiquity of the Epistle in the fact that it is quoted copiously—perhaps more frequently than any other New Testament book—in one of the earliest of uninspired Christian writings, the Epistle of Clement of Rome. Eusebius (iii. 37) takes notice of the attestation thus given by

Clement to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Clement's quotations indeed are, as usual with him, without any formal marks of citation, so that we are not in a position to say whether or not he believed the Epistle to have been written by St. Paul; but we can at least see that he knew and valued it. One specimen out of many is enough to exhibit the unmistakeable use he makes of it: 'Who being the brightness of his majesty, is so much greater than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For it is written, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But of his Son thus saith the Lord, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession. And again he saith to him, Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool' (Clement, *c.* 36; Heb. i. 3, 4, 7, 13). Of other early traces of the use of the Epistle, I only mention that Polycarp, both in his Epistle (*c.* 12) and in his last prayer at his martyrdom (Euseb. iv. 15), gives our Lord the title of Eternal high priest, which I look on as derived from this Epistle, wherein so much is said of our Lord's priesthood; and that Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 63), besides other coincidences, gives our Lord the name of 'our Apostle,' an expression peculiar to the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 1).

The Epistle to the Hebrews was accepted as canonical by the whole Eastern Church, with no exception that I know of; and that it was St. Paul's was also the received tradition and popular belief of the East. Clement of Alexandria unhesitatingly quotes the Epistle as Paul's: 'Paul, writing to the Hebrews, says so and so; writing to the Colossians, says so and so' (*Strom.* vi. 8; see also *Strom.* ii. 22). Elsewhere in a passage referred to by Eusebius (vi. 14) he accounts for the absence of Paul's name from the commencement, by the suggestion that Paul designedly suppressed his name on account of the prejudice and suspicion which the Hebrews entertained towards him. He quotes another reason given by the 'blessed presbyter,' by whom, there is no doubt, is meant Pantænus, Clement's predecessor as head of the Alexandrian Catechetical School, viz. that since our Lord had been sent as Apostle

to the Hebrews, Paul, whose mission was to the Gentiles, through modesty suppressed his name when doing this work of supererogation in writing to the Hebrews. Clement also gives his opinion that Paul wrote the Epistle in Hebrew, and that it had been translated by Luke, from which has resulted a similarity of style between this Epistle and the Acts. We need not scruple to reject the notion that a document is a translation from the Hebrew, which has the strongest possible marks of being an original Greek composition; and we cannot attribute much value to the reasons suggested for the omission of Paul's name; but it is plain that it occurred neither to Pantænus nor Clement to doubt that Paul was the author of the Epistle.

In the next generation the traditional belief of Pauline authorship was still the popular one at Alexandria. Origen repeatedly cites the Epistle as Paul's (*De Orat.* § 27, where it is coupled with the Epistle to the Ephesians; *in Joann.* t. 2 three times, citing as Paul's the passages Heb. i. 2, ii. 9, § 6, and vi. 16, § 11; *in Numer., Hom.* iii. 3; *in Ep. ad Rom.* vii. § 1, ix. § 36). In one place he refers to the fact that some denied the Epistle to be Paul's, and promises to give elsewhere a confutation of their opinion (*Epist. ad Africanum*, 9). But in his homilies on the Epistle, of which extracts have been preserved by Eusebius (vi. 25), he shows himself to have become deeply impressed by the difference of style between this and the Pauline Epistles; and he starts a theory that though the thoughts were Paul's, he might have employed someone else to put them into words. He says, 'The style of the Epistle has not that rudeness of speech which belongs to the Apostle, who confesses himself rude in speech, that is in diction. But the Epistle is purer Greek in the texture of its style, as everyone will allow who is able to discern differences of diction. On the other hand, the ideas of the Epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the Apostle. Everyone will confess the truth of this who attentively reads the Apostle's writings.' Again he says, 'I should give as my judgment that the sentiments are the Apostle's, but the language and composition belong to someone who repeated from memory the Apostle's

teaching, and, as it were, expounded the things spoken by his master. If then any Church receives this Epistle as Paul's, let it be commended for this; for it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as Paul's. Who wrote the Epistle, God only knows certainly. But the account that has come down to us is that some say that Clement, who was afterwards Bishop of Rome, wrote it; others that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.' Notwithstanding this criticism of Origen's, the belief in the Pauline authorship was little affected. Dionysius of Alexandria refers to the Epistle as Paul's without any expression of doubt (Euseb. vi. 41), and at a later period Athanasius counts fourteen Epistles as Paul's (*Festal Epistle*, 39).

The Epistle is included in the Peshitto Syriac translation; but placed as in our Bible; and it has been doubted, I do not know whether or not with good reason, if this part is of the same antiquity as the rest.

Such was the Eastern opinion; but in the West quite a different one prevailed. I have already given proof that at the end of the first century Clement of Rome valued the Epistle. It would be natural to guess that he accepted it as Paul's; but on that point we have no evidence, and doubts are suggested by the subsequent history of Western opinion. There are no authorities whom we can cite until the end of the second century, or the beginning of the third; but at that time none of the Western writers whose opinion we know regarded the Epistle as Paul's. I have already mentioned (p. 51) that Eusebius was struck by the fact that in a list of canonical books given by the Roman presbyter Caius, at the very beginning of the third century, only thirteen Epistles of Paul's were counted, and that to the Hebrews was left out. And I mentioned in the same place that the Muratorian Fragment agrees in not counting this among Paul's Epistles. It does not mention it either among canonical books; and there is a question whether it does not even put on it a note of censure. For (see the passage quoted, p. 50) it rejects an Epistle to the Alexandrians, feigned under the name of Paul, and favouring the heresy of Marcion; and many critics have

thought that under this description we are to recognize the Epistle to the Hebrews. But this seems to me more than doubtful. We have no other evidence that this was ever known as an Epistle to the Alexandrians; it is not under the name of Paul, and it does not favour the heresy of Marcion. That heretic did not include the Epistle in his Canon. If I were to indulge in conjecture, I should say that the Epistle which goes under the name of Barnabas better answers the description; but it is quite possible that forged documents, now lost, may have been put forward in heretical circles at Rome. We have other evidence that at the epoch of which I speak the Epistle was not recognized at Paul's. Photius (see p. 363) has preserved a statement of Stephen Gobar, a writer of the sixth century, that Irenæus and Hippolytus asserted that the Epistle was not Paul's. In point of fact we find very little use of the Epistle made in the great work of Irenæus against heresies. There are a few coincidences, but we cannot positively pronounce them to be quotations, and certainly the Epistle is never referred to as Paul's. Eusebius, however, tells us (v. 26) that in a book now lost Irenæus does quote the Epistle; but this still leaves the statement uncontradicted that he did not regard it as Paul's. The same thing may be said about Hippolytus, in the remaining fragments of whose works there are distinct echoes of this Epistle; but there is no proof that he regarded it as Paul's.

But we have in Tertullian a decisive witness to Western opinion. The controversy as to the possibility of forgiveness of post-baptismal sin was one which much disturbed the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century. The suspicion then arises that opposition to this Epistle may have been prompted solely by the support afforded to the rigorist side on this question by the well-known passage in the sixth chapter, which seems to deny, in some cases, the possibility of repentance and forgiveness. But what is remarkable is that Tertullian quotes this passage in support of his Montanist views; yet though his interest would be to set the authority of the Epistle as high as possible, he seems never to have heard of the Epistle as Paul's, and quotes it as Barnabas's; and not as canonical, but only as above the level of

the Shepherd of Hermas. 'There is extant,' he says, 'an Epistle of Barnabas addressed to the Hebrews, written by a man of such authority that Paul has ranked him with himself: "I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?"' And certainly this Epistle of Barnabas is more received than that apocryphal Shepherd of the adulterers' (*De Pudic.* 20). This is the language of a man to whom the idea that the Epistle was Paul's does not seem to have occurred; and the proof appears to be conclusive that in Tertullian's time the Pauline authorship was not acknowledged in the Western Church.

St. Jerome and St. Augustine, at the end of the fourth century, seem to have been the main agents in effecting a revolution of Western opinion. Jerome, though a Western, resided for a long time in the East, and was well versed in Greek Christian literature. He therefore could not be insensible to the fact of the general acceptance of this Epistle in the Eastern Church. He quotes it repeatedly, and more often than not without any note of doubt; but sometimes with some such phrase as 'Paul, or whoever wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews,' 'Paul, if anyone, admits the Epistle to the Hebrews.' But his most distinct utterance on the subject is in his Epistle to Dardanus (*Ep.* 129, vol. i., p. 965). There he says that this Epistle is received as Paul's, not only by the Churches of the East, but by all previous Church writers in the Greek language, though many think it to be the work of Barnabas or Clement; and that it is no matter who wrote it, since it is the work of an orthodox member of the Church, and is daily commended by public reading in the Churches. The Latins certainly do not receive it among Canonical Scriptures; but then neither do the Greeks receive the Apocalypse of St. John; and in both cases Jerome thinks that he is bound, instead of following the usage of his own time, to regard the authority of ancient writers who frequently quote both books; and that not in the way that they cite apocryphal books (for heathen books they hardly cite at all), but as canonical. Augustine also was influenced by the authority of Eastern opinion to accept the book; and it was accepted in Synods in which he took part—Hippo (393); Carthage,

iv. (397);* Carthage, v. (419); yet it is remarkable how often he cites the Epistle merely as that to the Hebrews, apparently studiously avoiding to call it Paul's.

The place of the Epistle in our Bible testifies to the lateness of the recognition of the Epistle as Paul's in the West. First, we have Paul's Epistles to Churches, arranged chiefly in respect of their length, the longer ones coming first. Then we have Paul's letters to individuals. Then comes this Epistle to the Hebrews; and this order, after Paul's acknowledged letters, is that which prevails in later, and especially in Western MSS. But the earliest order of all, concerning which we have information, is that of the archetype from which the Vatican MS. was copied. In the Vatican MS. itself, and in other Eastern MSS. this Epistle comes after that to the Thessalonians, and before the letters to individuals; but the numbering of the sections shows that the Vatican MS. was copied from one in which the Hebrews stood still higher in the rank of Pauline Epistles, and came next after that to the Galatians. The Thebaic version placed it even a step higher, viz. immediately before the Epistle to the Galatians.

In this conflict between early Eastern and Western opinion, if the question be only one as to the canonical authority of the Epistle, we need not doubt that the West did right in ultimately deferring to Eastern authority. It is only natural that an anonymous Epistle should be received with hesitation in places where the author's name was not known; but since the oldest and most venerable of the Western witnesses, Clement of Rome, agrees with the Easterns in accepting the Epistle, and since dissent is not heard of in the West till the beginning of the third century, we have good grounds for acknowledging its canonical authority. But the tradition of Pauline authorship is not so decisively affirmed as to preclude us from re-opening the question, and comparing this tradition with internal evidence.

I have already said that Clement of Alexandria took notice of one point in which this differs from all St. Paul's letters,

* But the Epistle is not classed with those long recognized as Pauline in the West. The list runs: 'Epistolæ Pauli Apostoli xiii., ejusdem ad Hebræos una.'

namely, the suppression of his name; and Clement's mode of accounting for this peculiarity is not satisfactory. In fact, through all the early part of the work, we should think that we were reading a treatise, not a letter. It is only when we come to the end that we find a personal reference—that to Timothy, and a salutation.

That salutation, however, 'They of Italy salute you,' suggests a remark. This vague greeting is only intelligible on the supposition that the letter was written either from or to Italy. Either the writer is sending home salutations to Italians from their fellow-countrymen in a foreign land, or he is sending his correspondents a friendly message from the natives of the country in which he writes. In either case some connexion is established between Italy and the Epistle; and therefore we are disposed to consider the Italian tradition as to the authorship with more respect than we should do if the Epistle had been despatched from one Eastern city to another.

There is another passage which very much weighed with Luther and Calvin in leading them to reject the Pauline authorship, viz. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?' (ii. 3). This sounds like the language of one of the second generation of Christians, who made no pretensions to have been himself an original witness of Christ; and it contrasts strongly with the language in which St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians disclaims having learned his Gospel from men. I will not say that the argument is absolutely decisive, because I believe that, during the interval between the two Epistles, opposition to Paul had so died out that there was no longer the same need for self-assertion; and it was no doubt true that he had not been a personal attendant of our Lord during His earthly ministry. It has been said, moreover, that when the writer says 'us' he is thinking rather of his readers than of himself. We may grant, therefore, that this verse is not by itself sufficient to disprove Pauline authorship; but it must be counted among the considerations which are unfavourable to that supposition.

On the other hand, there is one passage which used to be quoted in confirmation of the Pauline authorship: 'Ye had compassion on me in my bonds' (x. 34), words which agree with references made by Paul to his imprisonment in uncontested Epistles. But the best critics now are agreed that the reading δεσμοῖς μου probably owes its origin to the persuasion of scribes that this was a Pauline Epistle, and that the true reading is δεσμίοις, which has been adopted by the revisers of the received version. This reading makes better sense with the context. The writer is referring to a time of persecution, not extending to taking of life (for he says 'they had not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin'), but reaching to fines and imprisonment. And he notes how cheerfully in this persecution the Christians bore pecuniary loss and other sufferings, and how those that were free exhibited their sympathy with the prisoners. 'Ye endured a great fight of affliction, partly whilst ye were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly whilst ye became companions of those that were so used.' In every subsequent history of early Christian martyrdoms, a striking feature is the interest shown in the confessors during their imprisonment by their brethren still free—interest shown both by gifts to them and to their jailors while they were confined, and by support and countenance given to cheer them at the hearing before the magistrates. St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 16) notes it as one of the discouraging incidents of his first defence before the Roman tribunal, that no man had stood with him. A century later Lucian, in his tale about Peregrinus, scoffs at the contributions levied on their brethren by those under imprisonment.

One other passage remains to be noticed: 'Know ye that our brother Timothy has been set at liberty'—or, as some translate the words, 'has been sent away from us'—'with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.' The passage shows that the writer was not in bondage at the time the letter was written; and also that he was either Paul or one of his circle. It does not prove that he was necessarily Paul himself; but neither does it disprove it, even though we cannot fix any time in Paul's history for this imprisonment of Timothy.

On a comparison of the substance and language of the Epistle with those of Paul's acknowledged writings, it appears, I think, with certainty that the doctrine of the Epistle is altogether Pauline. Some critics, who have surrendered themselves to Baur's theories, have referred the document to the conciliatory school of which they take Luke to be a representative; and some have even asserted for it a more pronounced Judaic character; but as I quite disbelieve that at the date of the Epistle the Christian Church was divided into two parties of rancorously hostile Paulinists and anti-Paulinists, I see nothing in the letter which Paul or a disciple of his might not have written; and it certainly has strong traces of Paul's influence. In fact this very letter may be looked on as furnishing one of the very numerous proofs how little truth there is in Baur's theory of a persistent schism in the early Church. We have here a document earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem; and, for the writer, the controversy between Paulinists and anti-Paulinists absolutely does not exist. The great distinction for him is between unconverted Jews and Christian Jews; but that there were two classes of Christian Jews he seems not to have the slightest knowledge. He is himself a Paulinist: the only person he mentions by name is Paul's favourite disciple; yet he addresses Jews in a tone of authority and rebuke, without any apparent fear that his interference will be resented, or that he will be an object of dislike or suspicion to them.

As for the language, a number of parallelisms are adduced between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline letters. Thus, to give one specimen, Jesus is described in the 2nd Epistle to Timothy (i. 10) as 'having abolished death' (*καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θανατον*), the use of *καταργέω* in this sense being peculiar to Paul; and again, in 1 Cor. xv. 26, 'the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death' (*καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος*). Now we have in Hebrews (ii. 14), 'that through death he might destroy (*καταργήσῃ*) him that had the power of death.' So again Paley has noticed it as a habit of Paul's style to ring changes on a word, or to use in the same sentence several times the same word or different forms of it. An example will make plain what I mean. It is that in 1 Cor.

xv. 27, in which the Apostle argues from the words, 'He hath put all things under his feet,' and the changes are rung on the word ὑποτάσσω. Πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. Ὅταν δε εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. Ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. Here we have ὑποτάσσω six times in five lines. Now compare with this the commentary in Hebrews ii. 8, on the same verse of Psalm viii., in which changes are rung on the same word. Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον. Νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα. Further, examples are adduced of similarity of construction with that used by St. Paul. Thus, the change of construction from the third person singular to the first nominative plural in the sentence (Hebrews xiii. 5), 'Let your conversation be without covetousness: being content with such things as ye have' (ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος· ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν), is noted by Bishop Wordsworth as exactly paralleled by a verse in Romans xii., 'Let love be without dissimulation, abhorring that which is evil' (ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν). Lastly, the quotation, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord,' does not agree with the Septuagint, but is in verbal agreement with the citation of the same verse in Romans xii. 19.

These, and other coincidences with Paul, are more than can be attributed to accident: if the writer is not Paul, he must have read some of Paul's Epistles—in particular those to the Romans and Corinthians.* On the other hand, all the other O. T. citations are from the Septuagint, even where it differs from the Hebrew, which is contrary to St. Paul's usage. The writer seems habitually to have used a Greek not a Hebrew Bible. A notable case is his adoption of the

* Other parallels are Heb. xi. 12, *νενεκρωμένος*, Rom. iv. 19; Heb. xii. 14, *εἰρήνην διώκετε*, Rom. xiv. 19; *μετὰ πάντων*, Rom. xii. 18; Heb. i. 6, *πρωτότοκος*, Rom. viii. 29; Heb. xiii. 1, 2; *φιλαδελφία*, Rom. xii. 10; *φιλοξενία*, Rom. xii. 13; Heb. x. 38 = Rom. i. 17; Heb. xiii. 20, *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*, Rom. xv. 33; Heb. v. 12, 14 = 1 Cor. iii. 2, ii. 6; Heb. vi. 3 = 1 Cor. xvi. 7; Heb. vi. 10 = 2 Cor. viii. 24; Heb. viii. 10 = 2 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. x. 28 = 2 Cor. xiii. 1. There are coincidences, but not so numerous or so clear, with other Pauline letters; for instance, Heb. ii. 2 = Gal. iii. 19.

LXX. version, 'A body hast thou prepared me' (x. 5), instead of the Hebrew, 'Mine ears hast thou opened' (see also i. 6). His formulæ of Old Testament citation are also different from those generally used by Paul. He has *λέγει*, *μαρτυρεῖ* or *φησί*, sometimes alone, sometimes with *θεός* or *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, while St. Paul commonly has *γέγραπται*, or *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*; but there are exceptions which prevents us from pressing this argument confidently (Eph. iv. 8, v. 14; Rom. xv. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16).

This letter is said to have a much stronger Alexandrian colouring than have the writings of Paul. Several parallels, both as regards the thoughts and the language, have been pointed out in the writings of Philo; and there is a larger use of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament than in St. Paul's Epistles. With the Book of Wisdom, in particular, there are so many coincidences that Dean Plumptre has defended a theory that the two books have the same author, *e. g.* *πολυμερῶς* i. 1, Wisdom vii. 22; *ἀπαύγασμα* i. 2, Wisdom vii. 26; *ὑπόστασις* i. 3, Wisdom xvi. 21; *τόπος μετανοίας* xii. 17, Wisdom xii. 10; *ἔκβασις* xiii. 7, Wisdom ii. 17. Further, it is urged that this letter could not have been written by one who had resided long in Jerusalem, its descriptions of the Temple ritual not being founded on observation, but being entirely drawn from what the Old Testament tells about the Tabernacle.

But the strongest argument against the Pauline authorship is founded on the dissimilarity of style which, as I have already told you, was taken notice of by Origen. There is here none of the ruggedness of St. Paul, who never seems to be solicitous about forms of expression, and whose thoughts come pouring out so fast as to jostle one another in the struggle for utterance. This is a calm composition, exhibiting sonorous words and well-balanced sentences. In explanation of the difference it may be urged that this is a treatise, rather than a letter, and that therefore greater polish of style is natural; but the Epistle to the Romans has as much the air of a treatise as that to the Hebrews. This argument from the style is that which makes the strongest impression on my own mind. I have already shown that I do not ascribe to

Paul any rigid uniformity of utterance, and that I am not tempted to deny a letter to be his merely because it contains a number of words or phrases which are not found in his other compositions; but in this case I find myself unable to assert the Pauline authorship in the face of so much unlikeness, in the structure of the sentences, in the general tone of the Epistle, in the way of presenting doctrine, and in other points that I will not delay to enumerate.

But if the letter be not Paul's, whose then can it be? There are but two names which seem to me worthy of discussion. Luther guessed Apollos; and if we are to trust to conjecture solely, no conjecture could be more happy, for it seems to fulfil every condition. Apollos belonged to the circle of Paul, whose influence on this Epistle is strongly marked; and he would of course also be intimate with Timothy; he was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures (Acts xviii. 24), a description which admirably suits the writer of this letter; and he was a native of Alexandria, whereby the Alexandrian colouring of the Epistle is at once accounted for. There is only one thing against this conjecture, and that is that Luther should have been the first to make it. I will not urge this objection over strongly, because if one sentence of Tertullian's had not been preserved we should have no external evidence deserving of consideration for any authorship but Paul's. We may dismiss as a mere guess the suggestion thrown out in the Alexandrian schools that Paul might have employed the pen of Luke or of Clement; and the guess is not even a probable one. If dissimilarity of style is a good reason for believing the Epistle not to be Paul's, the same argument proves it not to be Luke's or Clement's, each of whom has left writings very different in style from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But what Tertullian says cannot be passed by without serious examination. When he speaks of Barnabas as the author he is plainly not making a private guess, but expressing the received opinion of the circle in which he moved. And since Tertullian was not only a leading teacher in the Church of Africa, but had resided for some time at Rome, I do not see how to avoid the conclusion that at the beginning

of the third century the received opinion in the Roman and African Church was that Barnabas was the author of the Epistle.

I freely own that if I had been set to conjecture the author, I should never have guessed Barnabas; but it is no reason for rejecting a statement, apparently coming on good authority, that it is not like what conjecture would have prompted. What we must really inquire is, whether there is anything about the statement so improbable as to make us unable to receive it. The Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been written after Paul's death; and we should not expect Barnabas to have survived Paul as an active worker; for he was not only the older Christian (Acts ix. 27), but apparently the older man; seeming to be of some standing (Acts iv. 36), when Paul is described as a young man (Acts viii. 58). I may add that Barnabas was taken for Jupiter when Paul was taken for Mercurius (Acts xiv. 12); but this point cannot be pressed, since the cause of the latter designation was Paul's powers of speech, and not his personal appearance. In any case, if Barnabas were the older, he might still have survived Paul, who did not die of old age but by martyrdom. Again, the missionary work of Barnabas has been so overshadowed by that of his companion Paul,* that it is natural to us to think of Barnabas as, though a very good man, not so able a man as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have been. If this be our impression, we ought to bear in mind how very little we really know of the grounds of the prominent position which Barnabas unquestionably held in the early Church. He probably was inferior to Paul as a speaker; but we have no such knowledge as would justify an assertion that he was incapable of writing the letter which has been attributed to him. The reason why we know so little of the missionary work of Barnabas after his separation from Paul is simply

* In the early part of his story St. Luke always speaks of 'Barnabas and Saul' (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, xiii. 2). But when he comes to relate their missionary tour, the order becomes 'Paul and Barnabas' (Acts xiii. 43, 46, 50). In Acts xv. 22, St. Luke, speaking in his own person, says 'Paul and Barnabas;' but (*v.* 25) faithfully reports the order of the Apostolic letter 'Barnabas and Paul.'

that no Luke has recorded it for us. Further, it is pointed out that this Epistle is very unlike that which goes by the name of Barnabas. But if it be admitted that only one of the two Epistles can be the work of Barnabas, we have a better right to claim for him that which Tertullian ascribes to him, than that which almost all critics reject as spurious.

Once more, it is said that the Levite Barnabas would be sure to have a first-hand knowledge of the Temple worship, and would not speak, as this writer does, like one who had derived his knowledge from books; he would have been familiar with Hebrew, and not have used the Septuagint as his Bible; nor can we think of him as so subject to Alexandrian influences as the author of our Epistle appears to have been. When Barnabas is described as a Levite, all I think that we are entitled to infer is that he had preserved his genealogy, and knew that the tribe of Levi was that to which he belonged. I do not think we are bound to suppose that he was a Levite ministering in the Temple service. But the important question is, Was he a Hellenist, or did he reside habitually at Jerusalem? The early part of the Acts would dispose us to form the latter opinion. It is certain that he early gained consideration in the Church at Jerusalem by the gift of the price of his estate; but it is not stated that Jerusalem had been his ordinary dwelling-place. He certainly had a near relation, Mary, the mother of Mark, resident at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 12, Col. iv. 10). But he himself is described as a native of Cyprus, and as keeping up his relations with that island; for it is Cyprus which he first visits when starting with Paul on a missionary journey, and again Cyprus to which he turns when separating from Paul and travelling with Mark. When men of Cyprus made converts among the Hellenists* of Antioch, Barnabas was judged by the Apostles the most suitable person to take charge of the newly-formed Church. How long he had previously been residing at Jerusalem we cannot tell, but from that time forth we never hear of him as resident in Jerusalem again. And it must be remembered that, even if it were proved that Barnabas had resided for a

* See Dr. Hort's note on the various reading of Acts xi. 20.

long time in Jerusalem, it would not follow that he was not a Hellenist, since we know from Acts vi. that there were Hellenists who lived at Jerusalem, and died leaving widows behind them there.

That Barnabas was acquainted with Alexandrian speculation is a thing which we should not have been justified in asserting without evidence; but we have as little ground for contradicting good evidence that he was. And that Alexandrian philosophy should be taught in the schools of Cyprus is in itself probable. I may mention, though without myself attaching much importance to the point, that the Clementine Homilies* represent Barnabas as teaching in Alexandria immediately after the Ascension; and in this they have been followed in several later legends. On the whole, feeling that the Western tradition in favour of the authorship of Barnabas deserves to be regarded as having some historical value, I do not find myself at liberty to reject it merely because, if I had been dependent on conjecture alone, I should have been tempted to give a different account of the matter. This view is taken also by Renan (*L'Antechrist*, p. xvii.).

To what Church are we to suppose the Epistle to have been addressed? The inscription, which is of immemorial antiquity, says, 'to the Hebrews,'† by which we must understand the Christians of Jerusalem, or at least of Palestine. For the promise (xiii. 23) that the writer would come and see those whom he addresses makes it impossible to suppose that this is a letter to Jewish Christians scattered all over the world, and not to a particular Church. The certain antiquity of the inscription is a strong reason for not lightly rejecting its statement; and there are two considerations which confirm it. One is, that throughout the Epistle no mention is made

* The Recognitions, which I count as the earlier document, make Rome the scene of the preaching of Barnabas. I take the view of Lipsius and Harnack, that the desire of the Church at Rome to claim Peter as their first founder made a story unpopular which represented his preaching at Rome as preceded by that of another Evangelist. Hence, the later version of the legend transferred Barnabas to Alexandria: afterwards, when the labours of Barnabas in Italy were acknowledged, he was handed over to the Church of Milan.

† The passages in the N. T. where the word 'Hebrews' occurs are Acts vi. 1, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5.

of Gentile Christians—the writer assumes that all whom he addresses are of the seed of Abraham. But no one dates the Epistle much earlier than the year 64; and where, except in Palestine, could we find at that date a Church of which Gentiles did not form a part, and probably the largest and most influential part? The second consideration is, that no other Church claims the Epistle. If it were sent to Jerusalem, the destruction of that city a very few years afterwards, and the dispersion of its Christian inhabitants, would explain the absence of a more distinct tradition. But there is no reason why any other Church to which the letter had been addressed should not have preserved the tradition, and taken pride in claiming this Epistle as its own. Those who suppose Apollos to have been the author very commonly suppose also that it was addressed to the Church at Alexandria. But if so, how is it that the members of that Church kept no memory of their own connexion with the letter? How is it that they knew less than did Christians in the West of the true account of the authorship? How is it that the general popular belief at Alexandria was that Paul was the author; while their most learned men, who found difficulties in that supposition, were reduced to guess-work in order to get over them? The same argument may be used as concerns Ephesus and other supposed destinations. There were for many years afterwards flourishing Churches in the places in question, none of which was likely to have forgotten so important an event in its history as the receipt of this letter. And the same thing may be said as to Renan's theory that the letter was addressed to Rome. If so, why did not the Church of Rome claim it? But there is a still graver objection. For Renan supposes the letter to have been written after the Neronian persecution, of which the imprisonment of Timothy may have been one of the incidents. How could a Church which had just gone through so fiery a trial be addressed in the words (xii. 4), 'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin'?

Against the claims of Jerusalem it had been objected that the writer's praise of his correspondents' beneficence (vi. 10) is not applicable to the Church at Jerusalem, which was rather the object of the beneficence of foreign Churches. But, on the

other hand, there was no Church to which the charge, 'Be not forgetful to entertain strangers' (xiii. 2), could be more fitly addressed than that Church which was the object of periodical visits from Christians of Jewish birth throughout the world. And the alacrity with which this duty was fulfilled might well have earned the commendations of *ch.* vi., even without taking into account the ordinary exercise of liberality from richer to poorer brethren. But the chief reason why some have rejected the claims of Jerusalem is the imagined hostility between the Christians of Palestine and the Pauline party, which is thought to make it inconceivable that a Pauline Christian should write to native Jews, addressing them in a tone of great authority, and expecting to get a friendly and respectful hearing. But I must set aside this objection as arising from a mere prejudice. The last act of Paul before he lost his liberty was to go up to attend a feast at Jerusalem; and for the unprosperous issue of that visit, unbelieving, and not Christian, Jews were responsible. Have we any reason to suppose that those of Paul's company who were 'of the circumcision' were so disgusted by the misfortune of their leader, that they thenceforward ceased to attend the feasts? And in particular, have we any reason to suppose that Barnabas discontinued this practice? or have we any reason to think that he ceased to enjoy that consideration among the heads of the Church at Jerusalem, which the earlier story exhibits him as possessing?

It seems to me a probable account of the origin of the Epistle, that Barnabas—if anyone prefer to say Apollos I shall not object, though Barnabas seems to me the more probable—going up to keep at Jerusalem a feast, subsequent to those recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, found the Church suffering from the pressure put on its members by their unconverted brethren, in consequence of which many of them had fallen away from the faith, and returned to Judaism. The visitor might then have spoken strongly of the disgrace and danger incurred by those who gave up the better for the worse. He might have spoken of the superiority of Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, over the highest of those intermediaries, whether human or angelic, through whom the

Jews boasted that they had received their Law; and of the High Priesthood of Christ as making an atonement for sin better than any that the Jewish sacrifices could have accomplished. If any such teaching were delivered in the Church of Jerusalem as that expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, I can well imagine the heads of that Church expressing a wish to their trusted friend that his doctrine should be embodied in a permanent form. It has been objected, How could one who did not profess to be an original disciple of our Lord (ii. 3) presume on such a tone of rebuke as in v. 12? But if the writer were Barnabas, although he was probably not an original disciple, yet he was a man of such standing and consideration, that he could well take upon him to reproach the members of this, the oldest of the Churches, that they, who ought to be the teachers of others, should themselves need elementary instruction. In fact, if it be once conceded that the letter was addressed to the Church of Jerusalem, the case for the authorship of Barnabas becomes very strong. Though I have refused to accept the Tübingen theory as to the amount of hostility between Pauline and Palestinian Christians, we know from Acts xxi. that there were many in Jerusalem who regarded Paul with prejudice and suspicion, and therefore that an ordinary member of his company would not be counted in Jerusalem a *grata persona*, whose instructions would be gladly received, and whose rebukes would be deferentially submitted to. Further, the Epistle to the Hebrews is a letter in which one who thought and wrote in Greek, and who seems only to have used a Greek Bible, presumes to instruct Hebrew-speaking Christians. We could understand that such an act might be ventured on by Barnabas, whose early munificence to the Church at Jerusalem, and long acquaintance with its rulers, gave him consideration. But I find it hard to believe that Apollos, or any other of Paul's company, could use the same freedom.

When we regard the letter as not written to Italy, xiii. 24 leads us to think that it was written from Italy: and we have then an explanation why the salutation* should be in general

* There is some kind of parallel to the vagueness of this salutation in that from the 'Churches of Asia' (1 Cor. xvi. 19).

terms. If the greeting were from definite persons, known to his correspondents, why should not their names be mentioned? But I take this to be merely a general intimation that the Hebrew Christians were held in kindly remembrance by the disciples of the place whence the letter was written.

Concerning the date of the Epistle, it is generally agreed that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. We cannot rely absolutely on the use of the present tense in speaking of the Temple services—this way of speaking being employed by Clement of Rome and others who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem. But the whole argument of *ch.* x., which asserts the superiority of Christ's unique and final sacrifice over those Jewish sacrifices, which betrayed their insufficiency by their need of constant repetition, can hardly be reconciled with the supposition that the Jewish sacrifices had come to an end before the time of writing, and were then no longer constantly repeated. And, besides, if we are to suppose the letter written after the destruction of Jerusalem, we could not account for the absence of all reference to an event so terrible to every Jewish mind, unless we were able to push down the date of the Epistle so late that the impression made by the fate of their city might be supposed to have died away.

As the destruction of Jerusalem furnishes a lower limit to the date of the Epistle, so the Neronian persecution has been held to give a superior limit; so that the date would come between 64 and 69: say 66 or 67. I feel by no means sure that the letter may not have been earlier than the time here assigned. If we compare this book with the Apocalypse, its calmness contrasts forcibly with the indignant description in the latter book of the woman 'drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus' (xvii. 6). Renan finds a clear reference to the Neronian persecution in Heb. x. 33, and especially in the word *θεατριζόμενοι*. But much stress cannot be laid on this word, which has its parallel in 1 Cor. iv. 9; and when the writer speaks of the 'former days' of the Church, he can hardly be supposed to refer to what had taken place only a couple of years before. I look on the reference in the passage just cited to be to the persecution that followed the death of Stephen. The verse

implies that the persecution under which the Church addressed was actually suffering was not so severe as that earlier trial. In any case it did not extend to the taking of life. The exhortation at the beginning of *ch.* xii., and the verse xiii. 3, would lead us to think that the disciples were then liable to suffer from legal penalties of a lesser kind. But their constancy would be severely tried if they had to bear no other penalties than those which, without the sentence of any magistrate, a bigoted people are wont to inflict on a minority who live among them professing an unpopular creed. We can see that some of the disciples were unable to bear the pressure thus put on them, their faith having failed through impatience at the delay of the second coming of their Lord (x. 36, 37). It is quite possible that Jewish Christians in Palestine might have been subjected to the trials here described, before the breaking out of Nero's persecution; and the verse xii. 4 seems to me to oblige us to date the Epistle before A.D. 63, which was probably the year of the martyrdom of James the Just. But since we can in no case assign a very early date to the letter, differences of opinion as to its date are not wide enough to make it worth while to spend more time on the discussion.

NOTE.

As a further proof of what was stated (p. 459) concerning the late recognition of this Epistle in the West, it may be mentioned that the *Codex Claromontanus*, written in the sixth century, the oldest Græco-Latin MS. of the Pauline Epistles, was copied from one which did not contain the Epistle to the Hebrews. At the end of each book mention is made of that which next succeeds. For example, at the end of Titus, 'ad Titum explicit, incipit ad Filemona;' but at the end of Philemon we have merely 'ad Filemona explicit.' Then follows a stichometrical catalogue of the books both of Old and New Testament, after which comes the Epistle to the Hebrews. The catalogue in question is carelessly written. It does not contain either Philippians or Thessalonians—probably from the eye of the scribe having caught Philemon when he ought to have written Philippians. Nor does it include Hebrews; but after Jude, and before the Apocalypse and the Acts, comes the 'Epistle of Barnabas,' for which are set down 'Vers. 850,' this being about the length ascribed to the Hebrews in

other catalogues. In this catalogue 1 Cor. is set down as having 1060 verses, a number bearing to 850 a proportion fairly corresponding to that between the actual lengths of 1 Cor. and Hebrews: whereas the so-called Epistle of Barnabas is nearly half as long again as Hebrews. Hence it has been conjectured that it is the Epistle to the Hebrews which here goes by the name of Barnabas; and the place in which it comes may strengthen this inference. After the Epistle of Jude comes the Epistle of Barnabas (verses, 850), the Revelation of John (1200), the Acts of the Apostles (2600), the Shepherd (4000), the Acts of Paul (3560), the Revelation of Peter (270). If what we know as the Epistle of Barnabas had been intended, we should expect it to come, not before the Acts of the Apostles, but in company with the last three books, with which it is associated in the *νόθα* of Eusebius (see p. 475).

Cod. Augiensis, an inter-columnar Græco-Latin MS. of the Pauline Epistles of the 9th century, does not contain the Epistle in Greek, but gives a Latin version occupying both columns; whence we may infer that the Greek of this MS. was derived from an archetype which did not contain this Epistle.

XXII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

NEXT after the Pauline Epistles I take St. Peter's First Epistle, the only document among those ranked in the early Church as 'uncontroverted,' which I have not yet discussed. At the end of the second century there was such general agreement between Christians all over the world as to the bulk of the books which they venerated as sacred, that in the preceding lectures I have had very little occasion to cite authorities later than the very beginning of the third century. On this account I have not hitherto quoted the passage in which Eusebius (iii. 25) sums up his views as to the New Testament books; but though it is somewhat later than most of the other testimonies with which we have to deal, the opinion of one of the most influential critics at the beginning of the fourth century is too important to be passed over in silence. You will find the passage translated and discussed in Westcott's *N. T. Canon*, p. 414. Suffice it here to say that Eusebius makes three classes of Ecclesiastical books: (1) *The Generally Accepted Books* (ὁμολογούμενα), of which he enumerates the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of Paul (and it appears from another passage [iii. 3] that he counts the Hebrews in the number), the former Epistle of John and that of Peter: to these is to be added, if at least it should so appear (εἴγε φανείη), the Apocalypse; (2) *The Disputed Books* (ἀντιλεγόμενα), which, however, are well known and recognized by most (γνωρίμων ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς), viz. that which is called James's, that of Jude, the Second Epistle of Peter, and that called the Second and Third of John, whether they belong to the Evangelist himself or to a namesake of his; (3) *The Spurious or Rejected Books* (νόθα), viz. the Acts of

Paul, the Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called Teachings of the Apostles, and if it should so appear (εἰ φανείη), the Revelation of John, which some reject, others count among the ὁμολογούμενα. Some also count with these the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Both these last two classes Eusebius includes under the general title of Disputed Books. He is clearly speaking only of books in use among orthodox Churchmen; for he goes on to speak of such works as the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, and Matthias, the Acts of Andrew, John, and the other Apostles, which he condemns as heretical forgeries, and as not deserving to count even among the νόθα. The odd thing in this classification is, that he mentions difference of opinion as to the Revelation of St. John; but instead of then, as we should expect, classifying this among the disputed books, he gives his readers the choice whether to place it among the 'accepted' or the 'spurious,' himself showing a leaning to the latter verdict. I imagine that the first class includes the books which were generally accepted in Churches without any feeling of doubt; the second class those concerning which doubts were entertained; and the third class those which generally were not admitted to have pretensions to Apostolic authority. I take it that the Apocalypse was received without hesitation by so many Churches that Eusebius felt himself bound to report its claims to the first rank; but that he himself, following the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria and other divines whom he respected, was disposed to place it in the third class. We are a little surprised to find no mention made of Clement's Epistle, since we know (Euseb. iii. 16) that it was included in the public reading of many Churches, as its place in the Alexandrian MS. testifies. There is no very apparent reason why it did not deserve to be mentioned as well as the Shepherd of Hermas or the Epistle of Barnabas; so that I feel by no means sure that the omission was not mere inadvertence. If not, the best explanation we can give is that Clement's Epistle did not claim to proceed from an Apostle, like one of the two books I have named, or to contain a prophetic revelation like the other.

I have found it convenient to speak here about this list

of Eusebius; but we are not immediately concerned with the questions I have touched on concerning his principles of classification; for Peter's Epistle is placed by him unequivocally in the first rank. And certainly the testimony in its favour is of the highest character; indeed, I do not know that any New Testament Book is better attested. The latest witnesses with whom I have usually begun, Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian,* all employ it. It is quoted also in the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons. It was included in the Syriac and in the old Latin versions. Eusebius (iv. 14) has taken notice of the use made of this letter in the Epistle of Polycarp; and this Epistle being extant enables us to verify the accuracy of the report, the quotations from Peter being extremely numerous; and his Epistle being more frequently employed by Polycarp than any other New Testament Book. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 12) quotes a passage from the heretic Basilides, in which the influence of Peter's Epistle is distinctly marked. I have already (p. 92) spoken of the use made of the Epistle by Papias, and shall presently have a few words more to say on the same subject. There are several resemblances to First Peter both in Clement of Rome and in Hermas, and at least in the former case I think they deserve to be regarded as quotations. I myself believe that the stories concerning the Redeemer's liberation of souls from Hades which early acquired so great currency† were suggested by 1 Peter iii. 19; but no doubt

* Iren. IV. ix. 2, xvi. 5; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 7; *Paed.* I. 6; *Hypotyp.* p. 1006, Potter; see also Euseb. vi. 14. Tert. *Scorp.* 12, 14; *De Orat.* 20; *Adv. Jud.* 10.

† See note, p. 365. In some of the Gnostic systems this liberation of souls from Hades is made to be the great object of the Redeemer's death. Hades is deceived into regarding the Redeemer as one of the ordinary dead, and so admitting the Spoiler who was to depopulate his kingdom. This was the theory of the Marcionites, described by Eznig (see Smith's *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* iii. 822), and of the Sethites of Hippolytus (v. 19, p. 142, Miller). Several orthodox fathers adopted the theory of a deception suffered by the devil in consequence of our Lord's humiliation; whereby he was tempted into a conflict in which he was sure to be worsted. The theory perhaps, presents itself in its most curious form in Macarius Magnes (see p. 163), who says that our Lord ensnared the devil by baiting the hook of his divinity with the worm of his humanity; and thus expounds the text (Ps. xxii. 6), 'I am a worm and no man.' But in this exposition Macarius is not original; for, on comparing what he says with Origen's *Commentary* on

this is only matter of opinion. However, the earliest attestation to Peter's First Epistle is that given in the Second (iii. 1); for those who deny this Second Epistle to be the work of Peter acknowledge that it is a very early document; and if it be a forgery, it is nevertheless clear that there was at the time when it was written, an Epistle already in circulation, which the author believed to be Peter's, on the level of which he aspired to place the second letter.

The external attestation to the Epistle being so strong, I attribute no importance to the only point in which it is defective, viz. that the Muratorian Fragment mentions neither Epistle of Peter. I myself believe that fragment to be later than Irenæus; but, grant it the greatest antiquity that has been claimed for it, and we have older testimony that the First Epistle was then in circulation. I cannot but think, therefore, that anyone professing to give a list of New Testament books would have been sure to name this Epistle, if not for approval, at least for rejection. Now, Westcott (*N. T. Canon*, Appendix C.) has pointed out that other work done by the scribe to whom we owe the preservation of this fragment is disfigured by hasty errors of omission. It seems to me therefore probable that a sentence has been accidentally

---

the same text, it becomes apparent that Macarius is drawing from Origen, who no doubt served as an authority to other succeeding fathers.

On the other hand, it is fair to mention the curious fact, which illustrates the precarious character of the argument from silence (see p. 159), that Irenæus, who elsewhere shows that he was acquainted with Peter's Epistle, does not quote it in connexion with the doctrine of our Lord's descent to hell. His chief proof of that doctrine is founded on a supposed Old Testament passage, which he cites four times (III. xx. 3; IV. xxxiii. 1, 12; V. xxxi. 1), 'The Lord God the Holy One of Israel hath remembered his dead which lay in the earth of the grave, and he descended to them that he might proclaim to them his salvation.' This passage had also been cited by Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 72), who attributes it to Jeremiah, and accuses the Jews of having cut it out of their copies. This interpolation has close affinity with 2 Esdras ii. 31. The other passages which Irenæus (V. xxxi.) cites in proof of the doctrine are Matt. xii. 40, Eph. iv. 9, Pss. lxxxvi. 13, xxiii. 4. Tertullian also (*De Anima*, 55) omits to cite 1 Peter; but it is easy to see that in this place he is following Irenæus. The passage of Peter is used by Clement Alex. (*Strom.* vi. 6). Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 16) has a notion peculiar to himself, that the Apostles descending to Hades not only preached to those who had died before them, but there baptized those so evangelized. On this subject may further be consulted Lightfoot's note (p. 131) on Ignat. *ad Magn.* 9.

left out, in which the Petrine Epistles were spoken of. The omission is to be regretted, not as regards the First Epistle, concerning which we have other abundant evidence, but as depriving us of some important guidance in our judgment about the Second. For the omission of mention of it in that fragment is a fact which has no weight, when the First Epistle also is not noticed.

I come now to the internal difficulties which have been alleged to warrant the rejection of so much external evidence. And first we must notice the indication of advanced date afforded by the fact that, when this Epistle was written, the Christians as such were subject to legal penalties. When Paul wrote to the Romans, he could tell them (xiii. 3) that rulers were 'not a terror to good works, but to the evil;' that they need not be afraid of the power; for if they did that which was good they should have praise of the same, 'for he is the minister of God to thee for good.' Paul's own experience, when brought before Gallio (Acts xviii. 14), had taught him that a man, against whom no charge of 'wrong or wicked villany' could be laid, would be protected by the Roman magistrate against an attempt to punish him merely on account of his religious opinions. But Peter's Epistle contemplates a state of things when innocence was no protection, when a man might do well and suffer for it (ii. 20). The name Christian had become a title of accusation (iv. 16); and a main object with the writer is to animate his disciples' courage to endure a 'fiery trial' coming on them solely on account of their religion. It has been assumed that it was the Emperor Trajan's rescript in answer to Pliny which first made the profession of Christianity illegal, and so, that Peter's Epistle cannot be dated earlier than that emperor's reign. But Trajan did no more than sanction the line of action Pliny had taken before he consulted him; and it is plain from Pliny's letter that the state of things he found existing when he entered upon office was that Christians as such were liable to be punished. Pliny states that he had never been present at trials of Christians, and consequently was puzzled how to conduct them. He was himself desirous to take a merciful view; and as he could find no evidence that Christians had

been guilty of any immorality, he wished that men should not be punished for the past offence of having belonged to the prohibited sect, provided they were willing to withdraw from connexion with it in the future. But he had no doubt of the propriety of punishing those who contumaciously refused to abandon their Christian profession. It is therefore quite clear that, if we wish to name the time when Christianity became a prohibited religion, we must assign an earlier date than Trajan's reign. To me it seems that the most probable date is 64, the year of Nero's persecution; and therefore, though I see nothing inconsistent with Petrine authorship in the fact that when the Epistle was written Christians were liable to be punished as such, I think that this fact forbids us to date the letter earlier in Peter's life than the year of the burning of Rome.*

I have already more than once had occasion to mention the chief cause of opposition to Peter's Epistle. Those who, with Baur, accept the Clementine Homilies as revealing the true history of the early Church, learn to think of Peter as an Ebionite in doctrine, and as permanently in antagonism to Paul. But the Peter of this Epistle teaches doctrine which has the closest affinity with that of Paul, and even adopts a good deal of that Apostle's language. I will not repeat the arguments I have already used to show the Clementines to be wholly undeserving of the credence Baur has given to their representations, and it is the less needful to do so because there are manifest indications that Baur's theory is dying out. In Germany, scholars who would think it an affront to be classed as apologists, such as Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, Keim, retreat from his extreme positions. Renan accepts Peter's Epistle, refusing to count its conciliatory tendencies as a decisive objection, and says (*L'Antechrist*, p. ix.): 'If the hatred between the two parties of primitive Christianity had been so profound as the school of Baur believes, the reconciliation could never have been made.'

* Lightfoot remarks (*Ignat.* i. 11) that it was not necessary that any formal edict against the Christians should have been issued. The mere negative fact that their religion had not been recognized as lawful would have been ample justification for proceeding against them as soon as it was recognized that Christianity was something distinct from Judaism.

One who, as Renan does, accepts the tradition that the letter was written from Rome, cannot reasonably be surprised at its Paulinism. Peter was not one of those rugged characters whom it costs nothing to be out of harmony with their surroundings; who, living much in their own thoughts, arrive at conclusions which they hold so strongly as to have power to force them on unwilling ears. Peter, on the contrary, possessed an eminently sympathetic nature. He was one who received impressions easily, and could not, without an effort, avoid reflecting the tone of the company in which he lived. I need only remind you of what the Epistle to the Galatians tells of Peter's conduct at Antioch; how readily he conformed to the usage of the Pauline Christians of that city, but, on the arrival of visitors from Palestine, fell back into the Jewish practice. What business should Peter have at Rome if in his mind Christianity were still but a reformed sect of Judaism, and if he had not risen to the conception of a universal Church? And how could he live in a Church, so many of whose members owed their knowledge of the Gospel to Paul's preaching, without sympathizing with the honour in which the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles was held? Was the man who did not hold aloof from Paul's company at Antioch, when the idea of the admission of Gentiles to equal privileges was still a novelty offensive to Jewish minds, likely to play the part of a separatist at Rome, after Gentile Christianity had established its full rights not only there but in so many cities of the Empire?

There has, indeed, been a good deal of controversy as to the place of composition of the Epistle. I need hardly remind you that at the close (v. 13) a salutation is sent from 'the Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you.' The early Church generally understood that Babylon here was a mystical name for Rome; but many moderns take the word in its literal and obvious sense as denoting Babylon on the Euphrates, a place which was the centre of a considerable Jewish population, as Josephus and Philo bear witness.* I will not trouble myself to discuss a third theory

* Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 3, 1; Philo, *De legat. ad Caium*, p. 1023.

which finds an Egyptian Babylon. The connexion of Peter with Rome has been so much insisted on by Roman Catholics, that Protestants have thought it a duty to deny it; and thus there is a certain number of commentators whose views have been so biassed, one way or other, by the effect their decision may have on modern controversies, that their opinion deserves to go for nothing. For my part, I so utterly disbelieve in any connexion between Peter and Leo XIII., that I count a man as only half a Protestant if he troubles his head about the Romish controversy when he is discussing the personal history of Peter. One might expect to find unprejudiced judges in men so advanced in their opinions that they ought to be sublimely indifferent to controversies between one sect of Christians and another. Yet it is curious how the scent of the roses will cling to the fragments of the shattered vase. Thus, Comte's Positive Religion, though not Christian, or even Theistic, retains a strong Roman Catholic complexion. Accordingly, on the present question Renan adheres to the view in which he had been brought up, and takes Babylon to mean Rome; while Lipsius, and other German divines, who hold the opposite opinion, appear to me not free from anti-Romish bias. I think that any critic who puts the Epistle down to the reign of Trajan ought to feel no difficulty in taking Babylon to mean Rome: for by the time of that Emperor's reign the Apocalypse must have had large circulation, and might well have influenced Christian phraseology; and in that book Babylon unquestionably denotes Rome. But for us who maintain an earlier date for the Epistle, the question is not so easy of decision. For then we must hold that it was St. Peter who set the first example of this way of speaking; and as his letter is not a mystical book like the Apocalypse, it is natural for us to ask, If the Apostle meant Rome, why did he not say Rome? On the other hand, the evidence that Babylon was the centre of a large Jewish population relates to a date somewhat earlier than the time of this Epistle. For Josephus relates (*Antt.* xviii. 9) that in the reign of Caligula, the Jews, partly on account of persecutions from their neighbours, partly on account of a pestilence, removed in great numbers from Babylon to the new and rising city of

Seleucia, about forty miles distant. And there new quarrels arose, in which the greater part of the Jews, to the number of 50,000 were slain. Thus it would appear that at the date of the Epistle there was no Jewish colony in Babylon; and so Peter's journey to that city, which in any case would be a little surprising, becomes quite unaccountable.

The most trustworthy tradition makes the West, not the East, the scene of Peter's labours. The passage in which Eusebius speaks (ii. 15) of the verse about Babylon is worth attention on account of the two earlier writers whom he cites. Eusebius tells that Peter's hearers had begged his disciple Mark to give them a written record of the Apostle's teaching, and that in compliance with this request the Gospel according to St. Mark was composed. And he goes on, 'It is said (*φασί*) that when the Apostle knew what had been done (for the Spirit revealed it to him), he was pleased by the eager zeal of the men, and gave his sanction to the writing for use in the Churches (Clement has recorded the story in the 6th book of his *Hypotyposeis*, and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, gives like testimony); and that Peter makes mention of Mark in his First Epistle, which it is also said that he composed in Rome, and that he himself intimates this, by giving the city the metaphorical name of Babylon.' Now, Eusebius elsewhere (vi. 14) quotes the passage from the *Hypotyposeis*, telling the same story as to the origin of St. Mark's Gospel; but with this difference, that when Peter heard what had been done, he neither approved nor disapproved. It is natural to suspect that the parts in the passage I have just cited which do not appear to rest on Clement's authority were derived by Eusebius from the other writer whom he cites, Papias. Now, the words, 'as I said,' in the passage of Papias cited, p. 92, show that there was a previous passage in which he had spoken of the relations between Peter and Mark. And as Eusebius further states that Papias quoted the First Epistle of Peter, the probability rises very high that the passage quoted was the verse (v. 13) which in the above extract Eusebius brings into such close connexion with the name of Papias. If this be so, we could not have higher authority for interpreting 'Babylon' in that verse to mean Rome; both because Papias lived before

the invention of the Clementine legend, and because his authority, John the Elder, was one likely to be well informed.

It must be added, that if the scene of Peter's activity were on the Euphrates at so late a period as that which I have assigned to his Epistle, it is unlikely that he should be found so soon afterwards suffering martyrdom at Rome. But the Roman martyrdom of Peter is very well attested. We gather from John (xxi. 12) that Peter did suffer martyrdom; and no other city claims to have been the place. At the beginning of the third century, Tertullian (*De Praescrip.* 36, *Scorp.* 15), and Caius (Euseb. ii. 25) have no doubt that it was at Rome he suffered. And Caius (see p. 377) states further that there were 'trophies,' by which, I suppose, we are to understand tombs or memorial churches, marking the spots sacred to the memory of the Apostles. Now it is reasonable to think that these could not have been of very recent erection when Caius wrote. The testimony of Dionysius of Corinth, also quoted by Eusebius in the chapter just cited, gives us reason to believe that some time before the end of the second century the Christian world generally acknowledged the Roman martyrdom.

If we are to understand that Peter gave to Rome the name of Babylon, we have an additional reason for assigning to the Epistle a late date in Peter's life. Such a name would not be given until Rome had, by its persecution of the Church, come to be regarded by Christians as the true successor of the tyrant city which oppressed the Church of the elder dispensation.

The question next comes under consideration, For what readers was the Epistle intended? The opening address recalls the Epistle of James, a document which I shall presently give reasons to think was known to Peter. The letter of James is addressed 'to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion' (ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ), a phrase by which we readily understand Jews living outside the limits of the Holy Land. St. Peter's Epistle is addressed to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς); but on

examination we find that in this case the 'Dispersion' does not consist exclusively, or even principally, of Jews. The persons addressed had been 'called out of darkness into God's marvellous light:' in times past they 'had not been a people, but were now the people of God' (ii. 9, 10). In this verse a passage of Hosea is made use of which Paul had employed (Rom. ix. 25) with reference to the calling of the Gentiles. The unconverted days of those addressed had been days of 'ignorance' (i. 14), days when they had 'wrought the will of the Gentiles' (iv. 3). It may be inferred from these expressions that the persons addressed are not Jews; and yet are not permanent residents in the countries addressed, but for some reason 'dispersed' among them. I do not lay stress upon the word παρεπιδήμοις as proving that those addressed were but temporary sojourners where they dwelt; for the thought was constantly present to the minds of Christians that they were but 'strangers and pilgrims' upon earth (ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι, Heb. xi. 13: see also Lightfoot's note on the address of the Epistle of Clement of Rome). It is possible that the word διασπορά may also be used here in a metaphorical sense, the Christians scattered among the world of heathen being regarded as a spiritual Israel dispersed among the Gentiles. But I feel much inclined to take the word literally, and to believe that Peter's letter was written to members of the Roman Church whom Nero's persecution had dispersed to seek safety in the provinces, Asia Minor being by no means an unlikely place for them to flee to.*

I have already had occasion to express my opinion that the Paulinism of Peter's Epistle proceeds beyond identity of doctrine, and is such as to show that Peter had read some of Paul's letters. In particular, the proofs of his acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans are so numerous and striking as to leave no doubt on my mind. I have just referred to the use in both Epistles of the same verse from Hosea; so, in like manner, both combine in the same way the verses, Isaiah viii. 14, and xxviii. 16, 'Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-

* An interesting paper, taking this view, was published by Dr. Quarry in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Jan. 1861. The use made by Peter of the Epistle to the Romans is dwelt on in the same paper.

stone and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed' (Rom. ix. 33, 1 Pet. ii. 6–8). There are many passages where there are distinct verbal coincidences, and especially in the directions to obedience to the civil rulers.*

There are isolated coincidences with other Pauline Epistles (compare, for instance, ii. 16, with Gal. v. 13; v. 8, with 1 Thess. v. 6; v. 14, with 1 Cor. xvi. 20). But it is with the Epistle to the Ephesians that the affinity is closest. A great many critics—Holtzmann, Seufert, Renan—have convinced themselves that it is such as to prove that Peter must have used that Epistle, and I had myself accepted that conclusion. I still hold it: though now that I come to lay the proofs before you, I have to own that they are by no means so demonstrative as I count them to be in the case of the Epistle to the Romans. There are several passages in Peter's Epistle which so strongly remind us of passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that the simplest explanation of their origin is that they were suggested to the writer by his knowledge of Paul's Epistle. But the resemblance is often merely in the thoughts, or in the general plan, without any exact reproduction of the words. We might conjecturally explain this difference by supposing the Epistle to the Romans to have been so long known to St. Peter that he had had time to become familiar with its language, while his acquaintance with the Ephesian Epistle was more recent.

Comparing, then, Peter's Epistle with that to the Ephesians,

* ὑποτάγητε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι (1 Pet. ii. 13);
πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω (Rom. xiii. 1).
εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν (1 Pet. ii. 14);
ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι (Rom. xiii. 4).
ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν (1 Pet. ii. 14);
τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον (Rom. xiii. 3).
1 Peter iii. 8, 9, is an abridgment of Rom. xii. 10, 13–16.
πάντες ὁμόφρονες, ταπεινόφρονες, φιλάδελφοι, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ, τοὐναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες (1 Pet.);
τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι, τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι, μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε (Rom.).
Compare also Rom. xii. 6, 7, with 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. Observe how the συσχηματίζεσθε of Rom. xii. 2 is reproduced in 1 Pet. i. 14 (the word not

we find that after the address, both begin with 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;' but the fact that this is also the commencement of 2 Cor. weakens the force of this coincidence, and the continuation in Eph. and 1 Pet. is quite different—ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς in the one case, ὁ ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς in the other. Again, in the opening of Peter's Epistle we have ἐκλεκτοῖς . . . κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς . . . ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος I. X. In that of Ephesians καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς . . . εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους . . . ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. There is here considerable resemblance in the thoughts; but when the passages are compared in full there is found to be a good deal of diversity in the language. The style of the opening of the two Epistles is much alike. Each begins with a very long sentence, Eph. i. 3–14, 1 Pet. i. 3–12, the clauses being connected alternately by participles and relative pronouns.

If we compare 1 Pet. i. 20, 10–12, with Eph. i. 4, iii. 9–11, we have the same doctrine of a mystery ordained of God πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, kept secret from former generations but now fully revealed, and exciting the interest even of the angelic host. Christ's exaltation above the angels is spoken of 1 Pet. iii. 22, Eph. i. 20–22. Both Epistles contain practical admonitions to Christians as to their duties in the several relations of life; but except in the directions to wives to be subject to their husbands, and slaves to their masters, there is very little similarity between those parts of the two

---

occurring elsewhere in the N. T.); and note the similarity of the thoughts, Rom. xii. 1, 1 Pet. ii. 5.

ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (1 Pet. iv. 1);
ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. iv. 7).

καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ χριστοῦ παθήμασιν, χαίρετε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε (1 Pet. iv. 13);
χριστοῦ, εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν (Rom. viii. 17).

μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός (1 Pet. v. 1);
τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς (Rom. viii. 18).

These are only a few of the more striking coincidences, but the list might be greatly enlarged if we included several where the same thoughts are expressed with variations of language. See Seufert in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 360.

Epistles. In both 1 Pet. ii. 4–7 and Eph. ii. 20–22, we have the comparison of the Christian society to a building of which each individual member is a living stone and Christ the chief corner-stone: but St. Peter is citing Ps. cxviii. 22, and Isaiah xxviii. 16; and the former passage may have suggested to Paul also the comparison of the corner-stone. It is to be noted that this passage from the Psalms had been applied by our Lord to Himself (Matt. xxi. 42), and is similarly cited by St. Peter (Acts iv. 11). Other coincidences are the κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος (1 Pet. iii. 4) with the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Eph. iii. 16); ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ (1 Pet. iii. 18) with δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (Eph. ii. 18); and the passage about Christ's descent to hell (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20) with Eph. iv. 8–10. The coincidences I have described have been accepted by many critics as proofs that the one Epistle was used by the writer of the other; Hilgenfeld, however, maintaining that it is Ephesians which is indebted to 1 Peter. Numerous and striking as these coincidences are, still when they are compared with those between 1 Peter and the Epistle to the Romans, the verbal agreement in the latter case is found to be so much closer that a good deal of doubt is cast upon the assertion that the former case is one of literary obligation. Lately Seufert (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1881, p. 179) has offered a new and rather startling explanation. He accounts for the similarity between 1 Peter and Ephesians as we account for that between Ephesians and Colossians, viz. that one document was not copied from the other, but that both had the same author; and of course in this case that author could be neither Peter nor Paul. I could point out a very formidable array of difficulties in the way of this hypothesis; but I will not spend time in refuting a theory which has not as yet gained adherents, and probably will never do so. The resemblances between 1 Peter and Ephesians are very much less numerous and less striking than those between Ephesians and Colossians; but in order to establish Seufert's theory they ought to be very much stronger: for we clearly can more readily recognize resemblances as tokens of common authorship in the case of two documents which purport to come from the same author, and

which from the very earliest times have been accepted as so coming, than when the case is just the reverse. So Seufert chiefly aims at establishing his theory by showing that the resemblances between the two Epistles cannot be accounted for either by accident, or by the hypothesis that one writer borrowed from the other. But there is a third explanation which in my opinion ought not to be left wholly out of account. Peter may have arrived at Rome before Paul quitted it, in which case there would be a good deal of *viva voce* intercourse between the Apostles, as there had been in former times. The doctrines taught by Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians would also naturally be the subject of his discourses to the Christians at Rome: and these discourses may have been heard by Peter. Having this explanation to fall back upon, if Peter's direct use of the Epistle to the Ephesians were disproved, I find little to tempt me in Seufert's hypothesis.

I have still to mention another fact establishing how completely this Epistle ignores all dissensions between Pauline and Jewish Christianity. This writer, who shows such strong tokens of the influence of Paul, equally exhibits traces of the influence of the Epistle of James. This phenomenon presents no difficulty to one who has accepted the Church tradition that Peter was the writer, and that Peter was on terms of close intimacy and friendship both with the head of the Church of Jerusalem and with the Apostle of the Gentiles. But on Baur's theory it is difficult to believe that a Roman Paulinist of the age of Trajan would have been a diligent student and admirer of the specially Jewish Epistle. The proofs of the use by Peter of the Epistle of James are sufficiently decisive. The phrases *πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις* and *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως* (James i. 3, 4) are repeated in 1 Pet. i. 7. The quotation from Prov. iii. 34, 'God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble,' is made in James iv. 6 and 1 Pet. v. 5 with the same variation from the text of the LXX. (*θεός* instead of *κύριος*), and is followed in both places by the same exhortation, 'Humble yourselves therefore that God may exalt you.' Another citation from Prov. x. 12, 'shall cover a multitude of sins,'

is also common to the two Epistles; and the phrase of Isaiah (xi. 7), ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε, quoted by Peter, is used by James (i. 11). I have already said that the address of Peter's Epistle seems to have been suggested by that of James.

It has been asserted that Peter also made use of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but this appears to me more than doubtful. One of the closest of the coincidences, viz. the use of ἅπαξ with respect to the offering of Christ (Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. iii. 18), is accounted for by the ἐφάπαξ of Rom. vi. 10. I have already (see p. 347) said something about the coincidences between Peter's Epistle and Peter's speeches recorded in the Acts.*

However much Peter may have availed himself of the writings of other members of the Apostolic company, he had so incorporated with his own mind whatever he had imbibed from them, that his letter, notwithstanding its borrowings, bears a distinct stamp of originality and individuality. We cannot read it without feeling that this is not the work of a literary artist, whose only aim is to make a clever imitation of the previously known Apostolic Epistles; but that, on the contrary, the writer's object is entirely practical. His mind is full of the condition of disciples who had already had to endure much suffering on behalf of their faith, and on whom he sees coming a still more fiery trial of persecution. His great object is to bring before their minds such thoughts as shall keep them steadfast under temptation, and give them patience and even cheerfulness amid their tribulations. In particular, he dwells on the thoughts (i. 6) that their trials are only 'if need be,' and only 'for a season.' In other words, he tells them that their sufferings will be found to constitute a salutary discipline, out of which their faith will come purified like gold from the furnace, and that after a while their brief period of trial will be succeeded by eternal

* In addition to the examples given (p. 347), there have been cited the use of τὸ ξύλον for the cross (1 Pet. ii. 24, Acts v. 30, x. 39), but see Deut. xxi. 23, and Gal. iii. 13; the claim to be a 'witness' to Christ (Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, 1 Pet. v. 1); the appeal to the O. T. prophets (Acts iii. 18, x. 43, 1 Pet. i. 10; and the phrase 'to judge the quick and the dead' (Acts x. 42, 1 Pet. iv. 5, elsewhere only 2 Tim. iv. 1).

glory. He dwells so much on this promise of future glory, that he has been called by some critics the Apostle of Hope.

I have already remarked that, if we compare passages in this Epistle with passages in former Epistles which may seem to have suggested them—for example, the exhortation to wives in this Epistle with St. Paul's instructions to wives in the Epistle to the Ephesians—we find here so completely new a choice of topics as fully to justify our assertion of the writer's originality. Other points peculiar to this Epistle are the prominence given to baptism (iii. 21) and the new birth (i. 3, 23); the doctrine of Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison (iii. 19); the interest taken by the angelic host in the Christian scheme (i. 12); the designation of Christ as the Chief Shepherd; and a whole series of topics calculated to raise the courage of sufferers for the faith (ii. 20, &c., iv. 12, v. 9). It may be added that a forger would have been likely to give to Peter some less modest title than *συμπρεσβύτερος*, and that we have an indication of early date, if not in the use of the word *ἐπισκοποῦντες* (v. 2) to describe the work of the presbyters (the reading here being doubtful, and the argument in any case not cogent), at least in the use (v. 2) with respect to their flocks of the phrase *τῶν κλήρων*, a term which came in very early times to be appropriated to the clergy.

XXIII.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

I HAVE already stated (p. 475) that Eusebius in his list of Canonical books (iii. 25) places the Epistle of James in his second class, viz. books controverted, but recognized by most. Elsewhere (ii. 23) having told the story of the martyrdom of James the Just, he adds : 'This is the account given of James, who is said to have been the author of the first of what are called the Catholic Epistles. But it must be observed that this is held to be spurious (*νοθεύεται*) : at least not many of the ancients have made mention of it, nor yet of the Epistle of Jude, which is likewise one of the seven called Catholic. Nevertheless, we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most Churches.' The suspicions expressed by Eusebius are more strongly stated by St. Jerome (*De Viris Illust.* 3), 'James wrote only one Epistle, which is one of the seven Catholic. It is asserted that this was published by some other person under his name, though as time went on it by degrees obtained authority.' We learn from what Eusebius says that there was current in his time a collection of seven 'Catholic Epistles,' which, notwithstanding the doubts of learned men, were widely acknowledged as authoritative. The complete subsidence of doubt about these Epistles in the fifth century is in itself evidence that they must have been very widely received in the fourth.

Eusebius himself, in his Commentary on the Psalms. quotes the Epistle of James as the work of a holy Apostle.*

* Λέγει γοῦν ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος· κακοπαθεῖ τις κ.τ.λ. (James v. 13); *in Ps.* 56, p. 504, Migne.

and as Scripture ;* and in the passages cited above he clearly gives us to understand that the cause of his hesitation about recognizing the Epistle was not any deficiency of acceptance in the Church of his own time, but infrequency of quotation by earlier Ecclesiastical writers. And it is true that Origen is the earliest writer whom we can produce as quoting this Epistle by name. He uses, too, a formula of citation, 'the Epistle current as that of James' (ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ, *In Joann.* xix. 6), which suggests that he entertained doubts as to the authorship. Elsewhere, however, he calls the writer James, without expression of doubt (*in Ps.* 30). There are several quotations in the writings of Origen which have been preserved in the Latin translation of Rufinus, whose faithfulness as a translator, however, was not such as to enable us to use his authority with perfect confidence. We seem to have an earlier authority in Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius (vi. 14) says that, 'to state the matter shortly, Clement in his *Hypotyposeis* gave concise expositions of all the Canonical Scriptures, not omitting the controverted books—I mean the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles, the Epistle of Barnabas, and what is called the Revelation of Peter.' Photius also (*Cod.* 109) adds his testimony that the *Hypotyposeis* included comments on the Catholic Epistles. On this evidence several have thought themselves warranted in asserting that Clement commented on all seven Catholic Epistles. But we are led to doubt this by the testimony of Cassiodorus (*De Instit. Div. Litt.* c. viii.).† He says that Clement made comments on the Canonical Epistles, that is to say, on the First Epistle of St. Peter, the First and Second of St. John, and the Epistle of James; and that he himself had had these comments translated into Latin, omitting a few things incautiously said, which might give offence. Now, we have every reason to believe that the Latin fragments of the *Hypotyposeis* printed in the editions of Clement are these very

* *In Ps.* 100, p. 1244.

† Cassiodorus, who had been minister to King Theodoric, in his old age (about A.D. 540) retired into a monastery, where he gave a great impulse to literary pursuits among monks, and himself became the author of several treatises.

translations of which Cassiodorus speaks. But the comments are on 1 Pet., 1 and 2 John, and Jude; not James. And since Eusebius has made express mention of Jude, we are led to correct James into Jude in the passage of Cassiodorus just referred to; and can feel no confidence in saying that the *Hypotyposeis* contained comments either on James or on 2 Peter. There are in other works of Clement coincidences with the Epistle of James, but all can be accounted for without assuming that he knew the Epistle. What seems most like a real quotation is, that in *Strom.* vi. 18, commenting on Matt. v. 20, he teaches that it is not enough for us to abstain from evil, as did the Scribes and Pharisees, but that unless we love our neighbour and do him good we shall not be 'royal' (βασιλικοί). There might seem to be a plain reference here to the 'royal' law of James iii. 8; but on turning back to *Strom.* ii. 4, p. 438, we find Clement insisting on the claim of Christians to the title βασιλικοί, having in view chiefly the Stoic ascription of kingly dignity to the wise man; and we therefore can build nothing on his later use of the same title.

Eusebius was not likely to overlook any express quotation of disputed books by early writers. But he might easily fail to pay attention to less direct proofs of their antiquity. Now, in the case of the Epistle of James, such evidence is forthcoming. I refer, in particular, to the Shepherd of Hermas. This is a book in which Scripture quotations, either from Old or New Testament, are scarce; but we are perpetually reminded of James's Epistle, the great number of the coincidences serving as proof that they are not accidental. The topics dwelt on by James are those to which Hermas most frequently recurs. Thus the doctrine of the opening verses of James is several times echoed by Hermas—that we must ask God for wisdom (*Sim.* v. 4, ix. 2), ask in faith without doubt or hesitation; for he who doubts must not expect to receive anything (James i. 7, *Mand.* ix.). He who so doubts is called a double-minded man (James i. 8), and the phrase διψυχία in this sense is of constant occurrence is Hermas. Again, there are exhortations to the rich, warning them that the groanings of the neglected poor will go up before the Lord (compare James

ii. 6, v. 1–6, *Vis.* iii. 9) All through *Mand.* xi. there runs a reference to the contrast which St. James draws (iii. 15, 17) between the wisdom which cometh from above (ἄνωθεν), and that which is earthly, ἐπίγειος. As examples of how the vocabulary of James is reproduced in Hermas, I mention ἀκαταστασία, ἀκατάστατος (James iii. 16, i. 8, *Sim.* vi. 3, *Mand.* ii. 3); καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος (James i. 27, *Mand.* ii. 7); καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης (James iii. 18, *Sim.* ix. 19); συναγωγή for the place of Christian worship (James ii. 2, *Mand.* xi. 9); ἐτρυφήσατε καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε (James v. 5, *Sim.* vi. 1); χαλιναγωγέω (James i. 26, iii. 2, *Mand.* xii. 1); πολύσπλαγχνος (James v. 11, *Sim.* v. 4); ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι (James iv. 12, *Mand.* xii. 6); καταλαλέω (James iv. 11, *Mand.* ii. 2, *Sim.* ix. 23). In conclusion, I mention two striking parallels: 'the worthy name by which ye are called,' James ii. 7 (τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμας), τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐπ' αὐτούς (*Sim.* viii. 6); and the exhortation (*Mand.* xii. 5), 'The devil may wrestle against you, but cannot overthrow you; for if ye resist him he will flee from you in confusion' (compare James iv. 7).

In the Epistle of the Roman Clement there are several coincidences which, in my opinion, are best explained as indicating that he used the Epistle of James, though I do not venture to say that any of them quite amounts to a positive proof. Thus, the quotation (*c.* 30) '*God* resisteth the proud,' &c., may have been suggested not by James but by 1 Peter; and Clement's independent study of the Old Testament may have led him (*c.* 10), to call Abraham the 'friend of God.' But though this title is twice found in our English version (2 Chron. xx. 7, Isai. xli. 8), the corresponding Hebrew word is not literally translated by 'friend;' and the LXX. render it not by φίλος, but in the first place τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ σου, in the second ὃν ἠγάπησα. It appears, however, from Field's Hexapla, that some copies of the LXX. have the rendering 'friend' in the first passage, and that Symmachus had it in the second. There seems also to have been a various reading φίλον for παιδός in Gen. xvii. 17, and Philo so cites the verse (*De resipis. Noe*, p. 401, Mangey); there is also an apparent allusion to it in Wisdom vii. 27. We therefore cannot argue as if it were

only from James that Clement could have learned to use the term. Still Clement's acquaintance with our Epistle must be pronounced highly probable, when we note how he dwells on the obedience as well as the faith of Abraham; when we observe other coincidences, as, for example, between *ἐγκαυχωμένοις ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ* (Clem. 21) and *καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις ὑμῶν* (James iv. 16): and when we bear in mind that James was certainly used by Clement's contemporary, Hermas.

In any case we are forced to ascribe to the influence of James ii. 23 the manner in which two Old Testament passages are combined by Irenæus (IV. xvi.), 'Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God': see also his use of the phrase 'law of liberty' (IV. xxxiv. 4), a phrase which seems to have suggested some of the preceding arguments in the same book. Hippolytus has been quoted as using the Epistle, the words (James ii. 13) 'he shall have judgment without mercy, that showed no mercy,' being found in the treatise *Concerning the End of the World* (*c.* 47); but this treatise is not genuine. The resemblances that have been pointed out in the writings of Tertullian appear to me to furnish no proof that he knew St. James's Epistle; and no mention of it is found in the Muratorian Fragment. On the other hand, the Epistle was early acknowledged by the Syrian Church,* and is found in the Peshitto.

It is curious that, as far as I am aware, no clear proof of the use of the Epistle is found in the pseudo-Clementines, although in the sect from which these writings emanated, James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, was accounted the highest personage in the Church.

From this review of the external evidence it appears that, although the antiquity of the Epistle is sufficiently established by the use made of it by Hermas, it must in early times have had a very limited circulation, and been little known either in Alexandria or in the West. But, on the other hand, internal evidence is altogether favourable to the claims of the Epistle.

---

* See Ephraem Syr. *Opp. Graec.* iii. 51.

Very early tradition asserted that the Church of Jerusalem was first presided over by James, 'the Lord's brother.' The pseudo-Clementine writings so far magnify the office of this James as to make him not only head of the local Church, but supreme ruler of the Christian society. We find no warrant elsewhere for this extension of the claims of James; but with regard to the Jerusalem Episcopate, early authorities are unanimous. Hegesippus (Euseb. ii. 23, iii. 32, iv. 22) not only relates that James was the first Bishop of Jerusalem, but also states that on his death Symeon, another relative of our Lord after the flesh, was made the second Bishop; and it was probably from Hegesippus that Eusebius derived the list which he gives of successors to Symeon. Clement of Alexandria also, in his *Hypotyposeis* cited by Eusebius (ii. 1), says that Peter, James, and John, after our Lord's ascension, were not ambitious of dignity, honoured though they had been by the preference of their master, but chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem. With this early tradition the Scripture notices completely agree. It is James to whom Peter sends the news of his release from prison (Acts xii. 17); James who presides over the meeting at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), and whose decision is adopted; James whom Paul visits, and whose counsel he follows on a later visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 18). The inferences drawn from these passages in the Acts are confirmed by the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 19, ii. 9, 12). I count it the more probable opinion that this James was not one of the Twelve. Possibly he had not been a believer in our Lord at the time the Twelve were chosen.

Critics are so generally agreed that our Epistle purports to have been written by this James who presided over the Church of Jerusalem, that I do not think it worth while to discuss the claims of any other James. Now the letter itself completely harmonizes with this traditional account of its authorship, for it appears plainly to have been written by a Jew for Jewish readers, and in the very earliest age of the Church. Hug (*Introduction*, vol. ii., sec. 148) has carefully noted several indications which, though they do not amount to a proof, at least point to Palestine as the place of composition. The writer appears to have lived not far from the sea.

He takes his illustrations from the wave of the sea driven by the wind and tossed; from the ships which, though they be so great and are driven by fierce winds, are turned about with a very small helm whithersoever the steersman desireth (i. 6, iii. 4). His land is the same as that of which it is written in Deut. xi. 14: 'I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil:' for he illustrates patience by the example of the husbandman waiting for the precious fruit of the earth, and having long patience until he receive the early and the latter rain (v. 7). And that wine and oil, as well as corn, were among the natural produce of his land is shown by his question, 'Can the fig-tree bear olive-berries, or a vine figs?' (iii. 12). The hot burning wind (*καύσων*) which, when it swept the land, withered up the grass (i. 11), is the same as that of which, according to the Septuagint translation, Ezekiel speaks, when he asks, 'Shall not the plant utterly wither when the east wind toucheth it? it shall wither in the furrows where it grew' (xvii. 10). It is the same wind which burned up the gourd of Jonah; the same probably whose approach our Lord (St. Luke xii. 54–57) represents His countrymen as exerting their weather-wisdom to forecast; the same which caused the burden and heat of the day spoken of in the parable of the labourers of the vineyard. Salt and bitter springs are known to the writer (iii. 11), and his country was exposed to suffer from droughts (v. 17).

The writer was not only a Jew, but he wrote for Jews. The address explicitly declares for whom it was intended—the Jews of the Dispersion,* the twelve tribes that were scattered abroad: that is to say, the letter was written by a Jew residing in his own land to his countrymen whom commercial enterprise had scattered over the empire; with whom migration from one city to another was an ordinary occurrence, as

* The term seems to have its original in Deut. xxviii. 25, *ἔσῃ διασπορὰ ἐν πάσαις βασιλείαις τῆς γῆς*. It occurs often in the O. T., *e. g.* Deut. xxx. 4, quoted Neh. i. 9; Ps. cxlvi. 2; 2 Macc. i. 27; Judith v. 19; but not in the technical sense in which it is here employed. And though Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 35), and Philo (*Legat. ad Caium*, 1023) speak of the dispersion of the Jewish nation, they do not use this word. We have real parallels in John vii. 35, and Justin Martyr (*Tryph*, ii. 7).

they said, 'To-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain' (iv. 13): a migration which may be illustrated from the New Testament references to Aquila and Priscilla, whom, though originally from Pontus, we find successively at Rome, at Corinth, and Ephesus, at Rome again, and at Ephesus again (Acts xviii. 1, 19; Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19). But to return to the proofs that the letter is from a Jew to Jews, the writer speaks of Abraham as 'our father' (ii. 21); he gives their place of meeting the Jewish name of synagogue (ii. 2); he assumes the Old Testament to be familiarly known by his readers, referring to Rahab, Job, Elias, and the prophets (ii. 25, v. 10, v. 17): God is designated by the Old Testament name the Lord of Sabaoth (v. 4); and the Mosaic law is assumed to be an authority from which there is no appeal.

The Jews, however, who are addressed are all Christian Jews. The writer describes himself as the servant of our Lord Jesus Christ, and addresses his readers as his brethren. He speakes of the worthy name by which they are called (ii. 7); and, in short, the whole letter assumes a community of faith between the writer and his readers. The history of the Acts relates a dispersion of Christian Jews resulting from the persecution that followed the death of Stephen; so that we are at no loss to seek for Christian Jews of the Dispersion to whom, at an early date, the letter might have been addressed. Syria, in particular, was full of them, and it is not improbable that this was the country to which the letter was in the first instance sent. I have already said the Epistle is found in the ancient Syriac Peshitto translation.

Further, there is every appearance that the writer of this Epistle had been a personal follower of our Lord. We infer this from the number of passages where we have an echo of our Lord's discourses. In the Epistles of Paul, who was not a hearer of our Lord during His earthly ministry, though references to the person and to the work of Christ are of constant occurrence, there is but little trace of the influence of our Lord's discourses.* It is otherwise here. There is

* One of the few examples of such influence is the saying (1 Thess. v. 2),

nothing indeed that we are entitled to say is directly copied from the Synoptic Gospels; but there are very many resemblances to the discourses of our Lord which those Gospels record, such as find their most natural explanation in the supposition that a hearer of those discourses, on whom they had made a deep impression, is perhaps unconsciously reproducing the lessons he had learned from them. The most striking example will probably have occurred to you: 'My brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay nay, lest ye fall into condemnation' (James v. 12, Matt. v. 37). But there is a number of cases where, though the resemblance is not so complete, it is sufficient to leave little doubt that it is more than accidental. St. James says, 'Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only' (i. 22): our Lord had said, 'Everyone that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man which built his house upon the sand' (Matt. vii. 26). St. James, 'the doer of the work shall be blessed in his doing' (i. 25): our Lord, 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them' (John xiii. 17). St. James speaks of the poor of this world as heirs of the kingdom (ii. 5): our Lord had said, 'Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God' (Luke vi. 20). St. James, 'Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you' (iv. 10): our Lord had said, 'He that shall humble himself shall be exalted' (Matt. xxiii. 12). 'Who art thou that judgest another?' cries St. James (iv. 12): our Lord had said, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged' (Matt. vii. 1). St. James says, 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, and it shall be given him' (i. 5); echoing our Lord's words, 'Ask, and it shall be given you' (Matt. vii. 7). St. James goes on to say, 'But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering' (*μηδὲν διακρινόμενος*): our Lord's promise (Mark xi. 23) had been, 'Whosoever shall not doubt in his heart (*μὴ διακριθῇ*), but shall believe, shall have whatsoever he saith.' Again, our Lord's words, 'Be ye perfect, as your

that the day of the Lord cometh 'as a thief in the night.' Our Lord's discourse here referred to seems to have deeply impressed His hearers (see 2 Pet. iii. 10, Rev. iii. 3, and xvi. 15).

Father in heaven is perfect' (Matt. v. 48), appear in James in the form, 'Let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect' (i. 4). St. James's denunciations of the rich (*c.* v.) reproduce our Lord's, 'Woe unto you rich, for ye have received your consolation' (Luke vi. 24). St. James's 'Let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness' (iv. 9), answers to our Lord's 'Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep' (Luke vi. 25). Other instances might be added, and in some of them, no doubt, the likeness may be only accidental; but the cases are too numerous to allow us to think that they are all chance resemblances. They are, as I say, not cases of quotation from the Synoptic Gospels, but have all the air of being independent testimony to our Lord's teaching given by one who draws his lessons from his own memory of what he had learned from his Master. I have already (p. 221) thrown out the conjecture that a great deal more of James's Epistle may be founded on sayings of our Lord than we have now the means of identifying; and, in particular, that what is said (i. 12) of our Lord's promise of 'a crown of life' may refer to an unrecorded saying of the Saviour.

Turning now to examine the date of the composition, we can infer that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, from the entire aspect which it presents of the relations between the Christian Jews and their unconverted brethren. The Apostle represents the religious difference as in a great degree coincident with a difference in social condition. It is the poor of this world who have been chosen, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which God has promised to them that love Him. The rich, on the other hand, oppress the disciples, draw them before the tribunals, and blaspheme the worthy Name by which they are called. And again, towards the end of the letter, the Apostle, in tones of one of the old prophets, denounces the luxury and wantonness, the grasping oppression and tyranny, of the rich, and lifts up his voice in warning of the misery that was to come on them.

Now the picture here exhibited well corresponds with that which is presented by Josephus and other Jewish authorities, of the condition of Palestine in the time following the death

of our Lord. The pride and luxury of the rich Sadducean party were at their height. They filled the high offices of the priesthood, which they had simoniacally purchased with money. They tyrannized over the poor. Josephus tells how the high priests sent their servants to the threshing-floors to take away the tithes that by right belonged to the poorer priests, beating those who refused to give them; and that some of the poorer priests, thus defrauded of their maintenance, actually died of want (*Antt.* xx. viii. 8, ix. 2).* It can easily be imagined that the religiously-minded of the Jews revolted against such practices, and that poverty and piety came to be naturally associated. It was most natural, too, that it should be among those who revolted against the worldliness and ungodliness of the men of high condition, that minds should be found best prepared for the reception of the Gospel. In fact, the poverty of the Jewish Church is proved by many indications. The Gentile Churches were, as a whole, not very rich. St. Paul says that not many mighty, not many noble, had been called; but yet the Gentile Churches were rich in comparison with the native Jewish Church; and in the Acts and in Paul's Epistles we read more than once of the contributions which the Apostle of the Gentiles collected among his converts, that he might bring them as alms to his nation and offerings. In somewhat later times Ebionite, a name derived from poverty, was that by which the Jewish Christians were known. We see, then, how completely historical is the picture which St. James's Epistle presents of the social line of separation which, as a general rule, divided the Christians from their unconverted brethren. But this picture belongs to a time before the destruction of Jerusalem. The rich classes courted the favour of the Romans, and by purchasing their support were able to maintain the tyranny which they exercised over their poorer brethren. Thus they arrayed against themselves not only the religious but the patriotic feelings of the nation. At length this patriotism burst forth in wild fury, which drew down destruction on the city. And then the Sadducean power came to an end; so

* See Derenbourg's *Palestine*, c. 15.

that it would be a complete anachronism to put any later that representation of the heartless, God-forgetting prosperity of the upper classes which we find in St. James's Epistle. The argument which I have here used convinces Renan, who accepts this Epistle as written before the destruction of Jerusalem.*

We find other evidence of early date in the indistinctness of the line of separation between the converted and the unconverted Jew. The Christian Jew, as we know from the Acts, frequented the Temple worship, and observed the national rites. James himself bore among his countrymen a reputation for the greatest sanctity.† But the Christians had besides of necessity synagogues of their own, private conventicles for their own worship. These were open to any unconverted brethren whom curiosity might lead to visit them. In the very natural picture drawn (*ch.* ii.) of the well-dressed stranger coming into the synagogue, received with high respect, and shown into the best seat, the poor visitor allowed to stand or pushed into the least-honoured place, it is plain that the visitors are men who have no recognized right to a place of their own; that is to say, that they are strangers to the community. Further evidence may be drawn from the statement that the rich oppressors harassed the Christians by bringing them before the tribunals. This cannot refer to Gentile tribunals. Down to a date later than any suggested for this letter, a charge brought against Christians solely on the ground of their religion would be received by a heathen magistrate as Gallio received the accusation brought against St. Paul. But the Roman policy allowed to the Jewish authorities considerable power over their own countrymen; and that not only in the Holy Land itself, but in the countries to which the Jews were dispersed. With respect to Syria, in particular, we have evidence in the mission of Saul to Damascus, where the power and authority given

* Des tableaux évidemment relatifs aux luttes intérieures des classes diverses de la société hiérosolymitaine, comme celui que nous présente l'épître de Jacques (v. 1 et suiv.) ne se conçoivent pas après la révolte de l'an 66 qui mit fin au règne des Sadducéens (*L'Antechrist*, p. xii.).

† See the account of James given by Hegesippus (Euseb. ii. 23).

him by the chief priests at Jerusalem would have sufficed him for the imprisonment and further punishment of those who called on the name of Jesus. It is plain, then, that when the Epistle was written the Christians were in the eyes of their Roman masters but a sect of Jews, and were as such subject to their national tribunals.

But we may go still further back, and argue from the total absence of all reference in the Epistle to the non-Jewish world. There is not a word of allusion to the existence in the Church of men of Gentile birth; not the slightest notice of the controversies to which their admission led as to the obligation of such persons to observe the Mosiac law. It is often one of the surest criteria of the date of a document to notice what were the controversial interests of the writer. In the present instance there is no notice whatever of that great dispute on which the assembly, whose proceedings are recorded in the 15th of Acts, was called on to pronounce, and of which the Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians are full, namely, the terms of justification of the Gentile believer, and the extent to which he was obliged to observe the Mosaic law. In this Epistle all its readers are assumed to be under the obligations of that law.

What I have stated would not be correct if the views could be maintained of those who look upon the latter half of the second chapter as an anti-Pauline polemic; some even maintaining that the Apostle Paul is the 'vain man,' who needed to be taught that faith without works is dead; though such language is so little fitted to the character of the historical James, that the theory that this chapter is anti-Pauline commonly leads to the theory that the Epistle is not genuine, but is the late work of some Jewish Christian opponent of Paulinism, who dignified his performance with the name of the 'pillar Apostle' James. In fact, to a disciple of Baur there is no more disappointing document than this Epistle of James. Here, if anywhere in the New Testament, he might expect to find some evidence of anti-Pauline rancour. There is what looks like flat contradiction between this Epistle and the teaching of St. Paul. St. Paul says (Rom. iii. 28), 'Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the

deeds of the law.' St. James says (ii. 24), 'Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' Our first impression certainly is that not only is the teaching of the two Apostles different, but that the one wrote with the express purpose of controverting what the other had said. But that opposition to Paul which, on a superficial glance, we are disposed to ascribe to the Epistle of James, disappears on a closer examination.

I postpone for the moment the question whether we can suppose that James intended to contradict Paul; but whether he intended it or not, he has not really done so; he has denied nothing that Paul has asserted, and asserted nothing that a disciple of Paul would care to deny. On comparing the language of James with that of Paul, all the distinctive expressions of the latter are found to be absent from the former. St. Paul's thesis is that a man is justified not by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. James speaks only of works without any mention of the law, and of faith without any mention of Jesus Christ; the example of faith which he considers being merely the belief that there is one God. In other words, James is writing not in the interests of Judaism, but of morality. Paul had taught that faith in Jesus Christ was able to justify a man uncircumcised, and unobservant of the Mosaic ordinances. He taught, and St. Peter also is represented in the Acts (xv. 11) as teaching, that it was only through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ that Jew or Gentile could be saved, and that it was therefore wrong to put on the necks of the brethren the yoke of other conditions asserted to be necessary to salvation. For this Pauline teaching James not only has no word of contradiction, but he gives no sign of ever having heard of the controversy which, according to Baur, formed the most striking feature in the early history of the Church.

On the other hand, no disciple of Paul would wish to contradict what James does say as to the worthlessness of speculative belief that bears no fruit in action. Paul himself had said the same things in other words, 'Thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more

excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge, and of the truth in the law. Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God?' (Rom. ii. 17–23).

I need not remind you what controversies there have been in the Christian Church on the subject of justification. Luther, you know, at one time regarded the difference between the two Apostles as irreconcilable, and applied a disparaging epithet to the Epistle of James. But whatever embarrassment the apparent disagreement between the Apostles has caused to orthodox theologians is as nothing in comparison with the embarrassment caused to a disciple of Baur by their fundamental agreement. For the disputes on the subject of justification all lie in the region of speculative theology; but about practical duties all are now agreed. Those who say that a man is justified by faith without works are careful to say also that a faith which does not bear fruit in good works is not a genuine faith. Taking their doctrine from what they conceive to be the teaching of Paul, they do not dream of controverting his instructions to Titus (iii. 8), 'These things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works.' But when Paul asserted that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law, he was not dealing merely with the question what relation to justification was borne by the works which all allowed ought to be performed. There was also the urgent practical question whether certain works of the law needed to be performed or not. One party said (Acts xv. 1), 'Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.' Paul himself said (Gal. v. 2), 'Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' This was no speculative question, but one that affected the practice of

every Gentile convert. As long as controversy on this subject was raging, it is inconceivable that anyone should discuss the subject of justification, and be absolutely silent on this great practical question. And therefore the fact that when James speaks of works, he seems to have only in his mind such works as men in all ages have accounted to be good, and makes no mention of the specially Mosaic ordinances, is convincing proof that he wrote either before the controversy concerning the universal obligation of these ordinances had arisen, or else after it had died out.

Critics of the sceptical school generally choose the alternative of assigning a late date to the Epistle, but they can hardly find one late enough to bring the Epistle into accordance with Baur's history of the early Christian Church. For according to Baur, at the time the Epistles to the Seven Churches were written, that is to say, sometime after the death of the historical James, the heads of Jewish Christianity regarded Paul as an enemy; and hostility to Paul survived down to the time of publication of the pseudo-Clementines. But as long as the conflict about the universal obligation of Mosaism was raging, how was it possible that a Jewish Christian should so completely ignore it as the writer of this Epistle does—a writer who seems to have no thought of ceremonial observance, and whose sole interest is to maintain that speculative belief is worthless, if it do not bear fruit in holiness of life? I could imagine an opponent of Paul affecting to believe that that Apostle's denial of the obligation of the Mosaic law included a denial of the obligation of the precepts of the Decalogue, and insisting on these precepts with the controversial object of making it believed that his adversary was opposed to them. But no one can read the Epistle of James without feeling that the writer has no *arrière pensée* in his assertion of the claims of practical morality: for he never makes the smallest attempt under cover of establishing the obligation of the moral precepts of the law, to insinuate the duty of compliance with ceremonial ordinances.

I consider that the proofs that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, by one who had personally been a hearer of our Lord, and who lived while His second

coming was still regarded as likely to be of immediate occurrence (v. 8), are so strong as to force us to reject the hypothesis that it was written by someone later than the James to whom it has been traditionally ascribed. An objection to his authorship has been raised on account of the goodness of the Greek in which the letter is written. But this argument is of no force. For though we should not beforehand have expected James to write in such good Greek, we see plainly that the letter was written by a Jew; and we can give no reason why James might not know as much Greek as another Jew. The only question, then, that seems to me worth discussing is, whether it was written late or early in that Apostle's life. As I hold that the controversy concerning the obligation of circumcision on Gentiles was one of very short duration, I could admit the Epistle to be later than that controversy, and yet to have been written by James.

The date we assign the Epistle depends very much on our determination of the question whether or not James had read St. Paul's Epistles. Several critics have held that the writer of the Epistle we are considering lived so late as to have become acquainted with an entire collection of Pauline Epistles, and with the Epistle to the Hebrews besides. I have already said that it seemed to me probable that this last Epistle was written in the lifetime of James, so that his acquaintance with it involves no impossibility. But the main proof of that acquaintance consists in the fact that in both letters Rahab the harlot is cited as an example of faith; and though the coincidence is certainly remarkable, it is scarcely enough to establish obligation on either side, ignorant as we are of the examples in common use in the theological discussions of the time. In fact it seems to me that one who had read Hebrews xi. would have found in that chapter other examples of faith more tempting for discussion than the case of Rahab. I think also that if James had read the Epistle to the Hebrews, there would have been some reference to the high priesthood of Christ, which is so copiously dwelt on in that letter. And in every respect the Epistle to the Hebrews shows signs of being the later document of the two. All through the writer shows his anxiety lest his readers should

be tempted to apostasy, of which there evidently had been examples even in men who had been partakers of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost (vi. 4); but the persecution suffered by those whom James addressed appears to have been both less severe and less formal.

The coincidences* alleged to prove that James had read the Pauline letters seem to me undeserving of attention, except in the case of the Epistle to the Romans. And even in this case there are considerations which make us hesitate before regarding these coincidences as proofs of obligation. If James had read the Epistle to the Romans, I think he would have avoided the appearance of verbal contradiction to a letter with the doctrine of which he is in such substantial agreement. It is not merely that he is silent as to the bearing on Gentile obligation of the question of justification; but on the general theological question he is quite in unison with St. Paul.

The representations of James are as unfavourable as those of Paul to the idea of a man being able to claim salvation as earned by the merit of his good works. 'What hast thou that

* Thus we may dismiss the case for 1 Thess., which rests on the common use of one word, *ὁλόκληρος* (1 Thess. v. 23, James i. 4); for Colossians, also depending on one word, *παραλογίζεσθαι* (Col. ii. 4, James i. 22); and for Philippians, with which again there is but a single coincidence, *καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης* (Phil. i. 11, James iii. 18), the resemblance here being much closer between James and Heb. xii. 11. I do not think any stress can be laid on the formulæ apparently in common use, viz. *μὴ πλανᾶσθε* (1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33, Gal. vi. 7, James i. 16), and *ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις* (1 Cor. xv. 35, James ii. 18). With Romans, again, the following coincidences deserve little attention, *παραβάτης νόμου* (Rom. ii. 25, James ii. 11), *νόμον τελεῖν* (Rom. ii. 27, James ii. 8), the phrases being such as independent writers might naturally employ. The question of justification had probably been discussed in the Jewish schools; and the example of Abraham was one likely to have been brought forward. So the three following are the only cases which suggest to me that the verbal similarity is more than accidental:—

ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν (Rom. v. 3);
τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν (James i. 3).

νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου, ἀντιστρατευόμενον (Rom. vii. 23);
τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν (James iv. 1).

οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου (Rom. ii. 13);
γίνεσθε ποιηταὶ λόγου καὶ μὴ μονον ἀκροαταί (James i. 22).

thou didst not receive ?' asks Paul (1 Cor. iv. 7): 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above' is the doctrine of James (i. 17). The latter Apostle teaches also that if a man offend in one point, he can claim no merit even though he have fulfilled all the other commandments of the law; the breach of that one precept makes him guilty of all (ii. 10). It is not merely the sinful act which brings condemnation; the sinful desire begins a course which ends in death (i. 15). And he gives the name of sin not only to the unlawful act, not only to the desire from which that act sprang, but even to the omission to use an opportunity presented for doing good (iv. 17). When James describes the law whose claims he enforces, by the title 'law of liberty' (ii. 12), he shows himself to be not at variance with Paul. There is then such a real identity of teaching between Paul and James, that I am disposed to believe that if James had known the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, he would have guarded against the semblance of opposition even in words. Yet I do not deny that he probably had an indirect knowledge of the doctrines taught by Paul, and of the arguments by which he was wont to support them. For the doctrine which James refutes has a certain likeness to the doctrine taught by Paul, though it is but a distortion and misrepresentation of it. We know, from the Acts of the Apostles (xv. 1), that St. Paul, in the course of his pastoral labours, met with certain who came down from James, and who professed to speak by his authority, and who yet taught, concerning the absolute necessity of circumcision and other legal rites, doctrines which St. James subsequently denied ever to have emanated from him (*ib.* 19). Were the men who at Antioch misrepresented the teaching of James likely to give a fair report of the teaching of Paul when they returned to Jerusalem ? And very possibly it may have been true that there were some who professed to speak as they had been taught by Paul, and who yet used language implying that a barren historical belief was sufficient for justification; and that good works not merely were to be excluded from the office of justifying, but might without injury be absent in him who is justified. We might expect that such teaching would be strenuously opposed by James, who

shows that he had so carefully treasured up his Master's words, and who probably had heard Him declare, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' But we need not doubt that such teaching would have been equally disowned by St. Paul.

If I am right in thinking that the Epistle of James is to be regarded as a document belonging to a very early age of the Christian Church, we can understand why specially Christian doctrine appears here in a less developed form than in later inspired writings, and why its teaching has more affinity with that of the Old Testament prophets,* and with the teaching of our Blessed Lord Himself, than with that of the letters of St. Paul, or even of St. Peter and St. John. Our Lord did not, during His personal ministry, reveal all the mysteries of His kingdom, but he left them to be taught to His Church by the Apostles whom His Spirit was to guide into all the truth. Paul was a chosen instrument for the revelation of Christ's Gospel; and it might well be that there was a portion of the truth, the need for dwelling on which was not so much felt by the elder Apostles until brought home to them by Paul's teaching, though they readily owned it when proclaimed by him.

But before we disparage the amount of specially Christian teaching which St. James's Epistle contains, it is well to look into the matter a little more closely. There was a time in the Apostle's life when he was but a pious Jew. It appears from St. John's Gospel that in our Lord's lifetime His brethren did not believe in Him. No prophet has honour in his own country, and the members of our Lord's family would naturally be the slowest to own in Him a being of different nature from themselves. But St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. xv. 7) that our Lord, after His resurrection, appeared to James; and it is not unnatural to ascribe to that appearance the great change which ranged James among those who owned the risen

* There are coincidences, also, with the book of Ecclesiasticus, but they seem to me not enough to furnish a decisive proof that that book has been used. One of the most striking is Ecclus. xv. 11, 12: Μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι διὰ κύριον ἀπέστην, ἃ γὰρ ἐμίσησεν οὐ ποιήσεις. Μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι αὐτός με ἐπλάνησεν, οὐ γὰρ χρείαν ἔχει ἀνδρὸς ἁμαρτωλοῦ. (Compare James i. 13).

Saviour as the great object of their faith. In the inscription of his Epistle he claims no honour from his human relationship with his Master, but describes himself as the servant of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ. What a change is it that where once he might have been entitled to bear the name of brother, now he only dares to call himself the slave; and in his form of expression puts this new Master whom he owned on the level of God, 'James, of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ the slave.' Christ's is the worthy name which he is proud to bear (ii. 7); Christ the great object of the faith common to him with those to whom he writes, which is described as the 'faith of our Lord Jesus Christ' (ii. 1). He is the 'Lord of glory,' and His second coming the longing hope of His Church. They must be exhorted to wait patiently for it as the husbandman waits patiently for the precious fruit of the earth (v. 7). The purpose of that coming, as expected by James and his readers alike, was that which we express in the words, 'We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge.' 'The judge standeth before the door,' cries St. James. 'Stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh' (v. 8, 9). And while yet separated from His Church, Christ is still its ruler and the source of its supernatural power. Miracles of healing were looked for, but it was in His name that the sick were to be anointed; it was He who should raise them up, and through whom they were to obtain the forgiveness of their sins (v. 14, 15). The man whose faith we have here described was clearly no mere Jew, but one whose whole religious life had Jesus for its centre and foundation.

But although St. James was very much more than a pious Jew, it is not uninteresting to study him in that character. There have been those of late years, both unbelievers and Christians, who have written lives of our Lord, and have striven to form a conception of that earthly life which, if Jesus be looked on only as an historical character, is still one of the most important in all its results for the human race. Well, if we wish to know the influences under which Jesus of Nazareth was brought up, what better evidence can we have than that which can be drawn from the character of another member of the same family, brought up with the same

surroundings, a character which we know, not only from the report of others, but as it reveals itself in his own writings? The very fact that there is less of distinctively Christian doctrine in St. James than in the other Epistles makes it possible for us to see in him, who seems to have been least changed by his Christianity, a type of what those pious men were among the Jews who, before our Lord's coming, waited for the consolation of Israel.

We see then in James, a man of few words, slow to speak, deeply alive to the guilt of sins of the tongue, counting the religion vain of the man who cannot bridle his tongue, meek, slow to wrath, humble, a hater of worldliness, whose sympathies are with the poor of this world, and whose indignation is excited when they are scorned in the house of God, a man of prayer, full of faith in the efficacy of a righteous man's fervent prayer, zealous for the law, yet not for mere ceremonial observance, imbued with the spirit of the prophet's maxim that God will have mercy and not sacrifice, and holding that the true *θρησκεία* is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world. Before we disparage the teaching of such a man, let us beware lest we disparage the teaching of our Lord Himself, with whom his character has much in common, and the topics of whose ordinary discourses seem not to have been very different.

If any are inclined to think that too much of the Epistle of James is occupied with moral precepts, and that by taking these for granted the space they fill might have been gained for doctrinal instruction, such persons ought to be reminded how needful this moral teaching was at the time when the Epistle was written, and how much of the success of Christianity was due to the pains which its teachers took in inculcating lessons which seem to us commonplace. Some Christian apologists have perhaps stated too strongly the contrast between Christian and heathen morality; not giving due credit to the excellence of some virtuous heathen, and too literally taking the representations of satirists as fair pictures of the general condition of society. Yet the historical student must own that since the publication of the Gospel the general standard of morality has been raised. For in heathen times

a man would have been regarded as of exceptional goodness if he practised those homely duties which an ordinary Christian gentleman would now count himself disgraced if he failed in. When Pliny set himself to inquire what was the 'sacramentum' administered to Christians at their meetings before daylight, the information given him no doubt truly told him the nature of the instructions given on these occasions. And what we learn that the disciples then pledged themselves to was what seems to us very elementary morality, viz. that they were not to rob or steal, not to commit adultery, not to break their word, and if the money of others were entrusted to them, not to appropriate it to themselves. It was, no doubt, a pleasant exaggeration of Juvenal to represent (*Sat.* xiii.) the faithful return of a friend's deposit as in his time such a rarity, that its occurrence might be regarded as a portentous event, demanding the offering of an expiatory sacrifice. Yet we need not doubt that by the Christian discipline the honesty of the disciples was raised to a marked superiority over the ordinary heathen level, and that a Christian came to be known as one whose word was as good as another man's oath, who would not lie, nor cheat, nor take an unfair advantage. We are warranted in thinking this, because Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 16) enumerates among the common causes of conversions to Christianity the impression which the honesty of Christians made on those who did business with them.

We have further evidence of the low state of heathen morality in another class of precepts, which we find much dwelt on in documents later than the Epistle we are considering. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (ii. 2), for instance, the disciple is instructed that he must neither destroy the life of his unborn child nor kill it after birth; and that he must not practise abominations which in those days were confessed without shame, but which we now loathe to speak of. I think that the nearly complete absence of warnings against sins of the flesh in the Epistle of James is evidence both that this Epistle was addressed to Jews, and that in such matters Jewish morality was higher than that of the heathen world. St. Paul, in his letters addressed to Churches in which Gentiles

predominated, finds it impossible to be silent on such topics. How much the moral standard of society was raised by these instructions, and by the Christian rule of expelling as a disgrace to their community those who transgressed them, we have evidence in the fact that three centuries later the Emperor Julian is scandalized by the revelation as to the previous character of Paul's converts, made in the confession (1 Cor. vi. 11) 'such were some of you' (see Cyril. Alex. *adv. Jul.* vii.).

In our times, as well as in his own, sayings of St. Paul have been caught up and distorted. It has been thought as needless to dwell on those fruits of faith on which he was always so careful to enlarge, as if experience never showed us the possibility that there might be what St. James called a 'dead faith.' Men have read with impatience St. James's inculcation of holiness, purity, unworldliness, meekness, as if these lessons obscured the teaching of that which was really important. But no true disciple of Paul can be offended at the proportion which practical exhortation occupies in the Epistle of James. For Paul himself put the production of holy living in the place of pre-eminence, as the end for which the whole system was devised: 'Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works' (Tit. ii. 14). Christianity gave men new motives and new powers for attaining holiness. But if they did not attain it, they had learned their religion in vain.*

* The Venerable Bede, in his prologue to the Catholic Epistles, printed by Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 614), says that the first place is given to the Epistle of James because he was bishop of Jerusalem, whence the Gospel preaching issued forth, and because he wrote to the Twelve Tribes, among whom were the first believers. From this fact that the Epistle of James is placed as first of the Catholic Epistles, we may infer that this collection was formed in the East, and at a time so early that the claims of James to the first place in the Church were still remembered. If it had been formed in the West, the Epistles of Peter would have come first, as they actually do in the Claromontane list (see p. 473).

In the first printed edition of the Peshitto, there is a heading describing the three Catholic Epistles which only it contains, viz., James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, as written by the three witnesses of the Transfiguration. But no MS. authority has been found for this identification of the James of the Epistle with the son of Zebedee; and this seems to rest solely on the authority of the editor, Moses of Mardin.

XXIV.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

IN my first lecture I said (p. 12) that I intended my investigation to be purely historical, and that I meant to discuss the evidence as to the authorship of the books of the New Testament in the same way that I should do if the subject of inquiry were any profane histories. By this course I gained the advantage of being able to set aside objections to the reception of our books drawn from the miraculous character of their contents; but I debarred myself from using the authority of the Church in fixing the Canon. This is not the time for discussing some very important questions of principle, such as whether the authority of Scripture depends on that of the Church; whether the Church has made any determination on the subject, and if so, when and how; and whether it is possible for her to err in such determination. I have been able to postpone such questions, because, plainly, if the decisions of the Church be correct, they will not be opposed to the results obtained by honest historical investigation. But I wish to point out that there is an important difference with regard to the assent we give when we adopt a Canon of Scripture merely on the authority of the Church, and when we do so as the result of historical inquiry. In the former case all the books of the Canon have equal claims on our acceptance; if the Church have decided in favour of Bel and the Dragon, that must be received *ex animo* as much as the Book of Genesis; if the verse of the Three heavenly Witnesses be part of the text adopted by the Church, it has the same authority as the verse, 'In the beginning was the Word.' On the other hand, historical inquiry ordinarily leads to results which we hold with unequal confidence. For some things the evidence is so convincing as to draw from us that un-

doubting assent to which we commonly give the name of certainty; other results may be pronounced highly probable, others probable in a less degree; in some cases our verdict may not reach beyond a 'non liquet.'

Now there are some who in theory reject the principle that the authority of Scripture depends on that of the Church, but who show that they have in practice adopted it, by their reluctance to recognize the possibility that there may be inequality in the claims of different books which we have been accustomed to recognize alike as Scripture. In laying before you the evidence for our books, I cannot but feel that to some of you it will be a disappointment to learn that in the two or three last cases we have to examine, the testimony is much less copious than in those which previously came before us; and a shock to discover that in any case it can be such as to leave room for doubt. I can only repeat that the ordinary condition of historical inquiry is to arrive at results which must be accepted with unequal confidence. The Church of the nineteenth century has no reason to complain, if she is not better off in this respect than the Church of the fourth century. Although in that age the great bulk of the books of our New Testament Canon were received with universal assent, there were a few about which the most learned men then hesitated. I have already told you of the two classes into which Eusebius divided our New Testament books. Whatever doubts Eusebius entertained with regard to his 'antilegomena' are repeated fifty years later by St. Jerome; and at the beginning of the fifth century St. Augustine still puts books received only by some Churches into a different category from those received by all. For he says: 'In judging of the canonical Scriptures the student will hold this course, that he prefer those which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive; of those again which are not received by all, he will prefer those which more, and more influential, Churches receive to those which are held by Churches fewer in number or inferior in authority' (*De Doctr. Chr.* ii. 12).

Now I will frankly tell you my own opinion, that since the end of the fourth century no new revelation has been made

to enlighten the Church on the subject of the Canon; and therefore that we can have no infallible certainty on matters about which learned men of that age thought they had not evidence to warrant a confident assertion. On the other hand, when, after long discussion, one opinion gains the victory, and establishes itself so as to become a universally accepted belief, that itself is a fact which is entitled to have some weight. And in some cases we can clearly see good reason for the recognition of documents questioned in the fourth century. Thus, the authority of the great majority of the books of our Canon, resting, as it does, on a general consensus of historical testimony, stands on a much firmer basis than if it depended on any early formal decision of a council, concerning which we might be in doubt as to the grounds on which the decision was made, as to the competence of the men who made it, and as to possible opposing testimony which that interference of conciliar authority might have prevented from reaching us.

In the case of the two Palestinian documents which have come before us in the last and in this lecture, we find it easy to explain why there should be some inferiority of testimony. If it had not been for the calamities which befell the Jewish people, it is quite conceivable that Christianity might have developed itself in some form similar to that in which the pseudo-Clementines present its early history, and that the head of the parent Church of Jerusalem might have been generally recognized as the ruler and lawgiver of Christendom. But there came first the Jewish rebellion, ending in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. After that, there still were Jews who clung to the site of the ancient glories of their nation, and Christianity had its representatives among them in a line of Jewish successors to James. But then came the terrible insurrection under Barcochba in the reign of Hadrian, on the suppression of which the very name of Jerusalem was abolished, and Jews were forbidden to approach the spot; and though Christians were to be found in the new city, Ælia Capitolina, which then replaced Jerusalem, they were of necessity governed by Gentile rulers (Euseb. iv. 6). We learn from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 31) that Barcochba during his

possession of power fanatically persecuted the Christians, and it is to be believed that after his death there remained great exasperation of feeling, indisposing men of Jewish birth to embrace Christianity. Meanwhile the Gentile Churches flourished and multiplied, and naturally were thenceforward little influenced by Jewish Christianity and its traditions. So we have no cause for surprise that the circulation enjoyed by the two Palestinian letters, the Epistles of James and Jude, was so limited as it appears to have been.

But what is really surprising is, that of these two, it is the letter of the less celebrated man which seems to have been the better known, and to have obtained the wider circulation. The external testimony to the Epistle of James is comparatively weak, and it is only the excellence of the internal evidence which removes all hesitation. Now the case is just the reverse with regard to Jude's Epistle. There is very little in the letter itself to enable us to pronounce a confident opinion as to the date of composition; but it is recognized by writers who are silent with respect to the Epistle of James. I have given (p. 493) evidence that Clement of Alexandria, whose knowledge of the Epistle of James is disputable, used that of Jude. Besides what is there quoted from the *Hypotyposeis*, Clement cites the Epistle elsewhere (*Paed.* iii. 8, p. 280, Potter: *Strom.* iii. 2, p. 515). The Muratorian Fragment recognizes it, and Tertullian (*De cult. fem.* 3), labouring to establish the authority of the Book of Enoch, adds as a crowning argument that it is quoted by 'the Apostle Jude.' We may infer, therefore, that Jude's Epistle was an unquestioned part of Tertullian's Canon. Origen repeatedly quotes the Epistle, though on one occasion he implies that it was not universally received.* I have quoted (pp. 475, 492) what is said by Eusebius, in which he seems scarcely to do justice to the use of this Epistle by his predecessors. Of these, in addition to Clement and Origen, may be named Malchion, who, in a passage preserved by Eusebius himself (vii. 30), clearly em-

* In *Matt.* tom. x. 17; xiii. 27; xv. 27; xvii. 30. In the first of these passages he calls the Epistle one of few lines, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace. In the second he interprets the τετηρημένοις in *v.* 1, of the work of guardian angels. It is only in the last of them that he uses the formula 'if any receive the Epistle of Jude.'

ploys the Epistle. It is included in the list of Athanasius (*Fest. Ep.* 39). Lucifer of Cagliari (about 357), quoting it, describes Jude as 'gloriosus apostolus frater Jacobi apostoli' (see *infra*, p. 525); and it, as well as the other Catholic Epistles, was commented on by Didymus of Alexandria, who died towards the end of the fourth century. Didymus mentions, but with disapproval, opposition made to the Epistle on account of the verse about the body of Moses (Galland, vi. 294). Jerome says: 'Jude, the brother of James, has left a short Epistle, which is one of the seven Catholic. And, because in it he draws a testimony from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, it is rejected by very many. However, it has now gained authority by antiquity and use, and is counted among the sacred Scriptures' (*De Viris Illust.* 4).

It is plain from the evidence adduced that Jude's Epistle early obtained a currency in the West, which was not gained until a later period by the Epistle of James. On the other hand, Jude's Epistle is wanting in the Peshitto. Several quotations of it are indeed found in the works of Ephraem Syrus, but only in those which have been translated into Greek (II. pp. 154, 161; III. p. 61); and there is room for doubt whether this use of Jude was made by Ephraem himself, or introduced by the translator.*

Notwithstanding the wide circulation of Jude's Epistle in early times, I find no reason to think that our earliest authorities knew more either about its author or the occasion of its composition than they could learn from the document itself. We need not doubt that it is a real relic of the first age of the Church, both because there is no trace of any motive such as might inspire a forgery, and also because a forger would certainly have inscribed his production with some more dis-

* The Peshitto list only containing three Catholic Epistles is referred to in the Iambics of Amphilochius of Iconium, who died about 395 (Galland, vi. 495):—

καθολικὰς ἐπιστολὰς
τινὲς μὲν ἑπτά φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας
χρῆναι δέχεσθαι, τὴν Ἰακώβου μίαν,
μίαν δὲ Πέτρου, τήν τ' Ἰωάννου μίαν.
τινὲς δὲ τὰς τρεῖς, καὶ πρὸς αὐταῖς τὰς δύο
Πέτρου δέχονται, τὴν Ἰούδα δ' ἐβδόμην.

tinguished name. The letter professes to come from 'Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.' We may regard it as certain that the James here intended is the well-known James who presided over the Church of Jerusalem, and thus that the Epistle clearly belongs to the Palestinian section of the Church. This James is, no doubt, also he who is called the Lord's brother (Gal. i. 19). Now the names of our Lord's brethren are given (Matt. xiii. 55) as James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas; and in the parallel passage of Mark (vi. 3) as James, Joses, Judas, and Simon. We may take for granted that the Judas here named is the author of our Epistle. We may also believe that it is the same Jude who is mentioned in a tradition preserved by Hegesippus (Euseb. iii. 20), that informers attempted to excite the jealousy of Domitian against two of our Lord's family, 'grandsons of Jude, who is said to have been his brother after the flesh.'* On being questioned by the Emperor as to their property, they told him that they had no money, and possessed only a small farm, which they owned in common and cultivated with their own hands, its value not being more than 9000 denarii. Then they showed him their hands, and when he saw them horny with continual toil he was convinced of the truth of the story. As for the kingdom which they were accused of expecting, they assured him that it was no earthly kingdom, but a heavenly one; when Christ should come at the end of the world to judge the quick and dead. On this the Emperor, regarding them as beneath his jealousy, dismissed them; and they survived to the reign of Trajan, held in honour in the Churches, both on account of this their confession and of their kindred to our Lord.

There is a Judas, who may or may not be another, in the list of the Apostles, as given by St. Luke (vi. 16, Acts i. 13), and recognized by St. John (xiv. 22). This Judas occupies the place of one who in the lists of Matthew (x. 3) and Mark (iii. 18), is called Lebbeus, or Thaddeus.† I may re-

* In a newly recovered fragment of Philip of Side (see p. 319), it is stated that Hegesippus gives the names of these grandsons, viz., Zocer and James.

† There is a question of reading here which I will not delay to discuss; but it is important to mention that in Matt. x. 3 there is a well-attested old Latin reading: 'Judas Zelotes,' instead of Thaddæus, and that our

mind you in passing that in the Abgar legend (see p. 355) Thaddeus is represented not as an Apostle, but as one of the Seventy, and that he is not called Judas—a name which is treated as belonging to Thomas. St. Luke describes the Apostle Judas as Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου; and though the natural translation of the words is 'Jude, the son of James,' the Authorized Version renders Jude the brother of James, no doubt because the Apostle was identified with the author of our Epistle. But it is very doubtful whether this identification can be maintained. The author of the Epistle not only does not call himself an Apostle in his inscription, but seems to distinguish himself from the Apostles (*v.* 17).

On the question, what we are to understand by 'the brethren of our Lord,' you ought to consult Bishop Lightfoot's Dissertation II., appended to his Commentary on Galatians. We have, I think, to choose between the hypothesis, that these 'brethren' were sons of Joseph by a former wife, or that they were near kinsmen who, according to Hebrew usage, might be called brethren. It is always best to confess ignorance when we have not the means of certain knowledge, and it does not seem to me that we have it in this instance. I believe that Epiphanius, Jerome, and most others, who are appealed to as authorities, had no more means of real knowledge than ourselves. The arguments on both sides which seem to me really deserving of attention are the following: (1) The manner in which the four brothers are mentioned in Matt. xiii. 55, would scarcely be natural if they were not members of the same household as our Lord. (2) The Protevangelium, and the Gospel according to St. Peter (as we know from Origen's Commentary on Matt. xiii. 55), represent these brethren as sons of Joseph by a former wife. (3) Hegesippus describing Simeon, the second Bishop of Jerusalem, as our Lord's cousin, never calls him brother of our Lord as he does James and Jude. These, being second-century authorities, may be supposed likely to speak from

Epistle is described as 'Judæ Zelotis' in the catalogue of canonical books commonly ascribed to Gelasius, but which, according to Thiel (*Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 58), is rather to be referred to Pope Damasus. But concerning this list, see Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 195.

knowledge. But it is possible that all three may be too late for such knowledge; and a difficulty arises from the fact of Simeon's election as second Bishop of Jerusalem. For Jude's Epistle exhibits much greater corruption of morals among professing Christians than that of James, so that it is natural to think that Jude survived James; and since his kinship to our Lord appears to have been a main reason for the choice of Simeon, the question arises, If Jude were known as a 'brother of our Lord,' and Simeon not, would not the choice have fallen on Jude, whose Epistle shows him to have had, besides the claims of birth, those also of piety and ability? On the other hand, the choice of Simeon would be intelligible if he were Jude's elder brother; and we know (Matt. xiii. 55) that Jude had a brother called Simon.

Again, we find (Matt. xxvii. 56) that there were a James and Joses who were not the sons of a deceased wife of Joseph, but who had a mother living at the time of the Crucifixion. It is, no doubt, possible that the three 'brethren of our Lord,' James, Joses, and Simon, had three cousins—brothers also—named James, Joses, and Simon; but the more natural supposition is, that the same James and Joses are spoken of in both places.

Weighing the arguments on both sides, I think the preponderance is on the side of those for the adoption of the theory that these 'brethren' were sons of Joseph. This is as far as we know, the older opinion; for Lightfoot has been successful in showing that the 'cousin' theory cannot be traced higher than St. Jerome. At the same time the matter appears to me by no means free from doubt. I agree with Lightfoot in thinking that neither James nor Jude was among the Twelve.

Concerning the date of the Epistle, our determination is materially affected by the view we take of the persons whose immorality and contempt of dignities the Apostle censures. I have already mentioned (p. 27) that Renan imagines that Jude wished his readers to understand the Apostle Paul. Renan can thus date the letter as early as 54. But he stands alone in this fantastic criticism. Clement of Alex-

andria, in a passage already cited, supposes that Jude spoke prophetically of the immoral teaching of Carpocrates; and some modern critics, sharing the view that the Epistle is directed against this form of Gnosticism, consider that it cannot be earlier than the second century. I have already had occasion to mention (p. 362) that on the doctrine common to the Gnostic sects, of the essential impurity of matter, two opposite rules of life were founded. The earliest seems to have been a rigorously ascetic rule, men hoping that by mortifying the body they could make the soul more pure and more vigorous. But before long there were others who held that by knowledge the soul could be so elevated as to suffer no detriment from the deeds of the body, however gross they might be. Nay, there were some who, accepting the doctrine of the Old Testament, that the precepts of the Decalogue came from him who made the world, but believing also that the creation of matter had been a bad work, inculcated the violation of these precepts as a duty, in order to exhibit hostility to the evil Being or Beings who had created the world. To this immoral type of Gnosticism the teaching of Carpocrates belonged; but I see no warrant for asserting that any such systematic justification of immorality had been developed when our Epistle was written. I find nothing in this Epistle to prevent our assigning it to the Apostolic age; for other Apostles had had cause to complain of impurity, which had already crept into the Church (2 Cor. xii. 21; Phil. iii. 19; Rev. ii. 20–22). Some critics (*e.g.* Schenkel, in his *Bible Lexicon*) have discovered Gnostic theories in *v.* 4, inferring from it that those whom Jude opposed did not believe in the unity of God, and defended their evil practices by maintaining the duty of antagonism to the Creator. But I consider that Jude's words, 'denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ,' no more of necessity imply doctrinal error than do Paul's words, in the passage of Philippians just cited, 'enemies of the Cross of Christ.' And those whom Jude in the same verse describes as 'turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness' seem to me not different from those who, 'having been called unto liberty, used liberty for an occasion to the flesh' (Gal. v. 13). St. Paul in the beginning of 1 Cor. x. had

used the same example which St. Jude employs in warning those men of corrupt hearts who, having slipped into the Church, presumed on the grace they had received. Both Apostles remind them of the fate of those Israelites of old, who, though they had escaped out of the land of Egypt, yet suffered in the wilderness the penalty of their unbelief and disobedience. And Jude adds the further example, that even angels fell. On the whole, I conclude that the evils under which Jude's Epistle reveals the Church to be suffering are not essentially different from those the existence of which we learn from Paul's Epistles; and therefore that we are not forced to bring the authorship down to the second century. Nothing forbids us to give it the date it must have had if really written by Jude the brother of James, namely, before the reign of Domitian, by which time Hegesippus gives us to understand that Jude had died.

I will add, that there does not seem to me to be sufficient evidence that those whom Jude condemns were teachers of false doctrine, or even teachers at all. I think his language is fully satisfied if we suppose them to be private members of the Church who lived ungodly lives, and who were insubordinate and contumelious when rebuked by their spiritual superiors.*

It remains to say something about what Jerome states to have been a bar to the reception of Jude's Epistle, namely, its use of Jewish apocryphal literature. Two passages in particular demand attention. In the first place, Origen states (*De Princip.* iii. 2) that the mention (*v.* 9) of the contest for the body of Moses, between Michael the Archangel and the Devil, is derived from an apocryphal book called the As-

* The Revised Version translates ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες (*v.* 12), 'shepherds that without fear feed themselves,' looking on the passage as containing a reference to Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 'Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves.' But the words in the LXX. there are βόσκουσιν ἑαυτούς, and Jude's words convey to me a different idea; not that of self-seeking clergy, but of schismatical laity who separate themselves from the flock of Christ, and are not afraid to be their own shepherds. Lucifer (*De non conven. cum hæret.*, p. 794, Migne) renders 'semetipsos regentes.' Many of the phrases packed together in Jude's Epistle might each be the text of a discourse; so that I could easily believe that we had in this Epistle heads of topics enlarged on, either in a longer document, or by the Apostle himself in *viva voce* addresses.

sumption of Moses. The same thing is intimated in a passage of Didymus, already referred to, and in a passage of Apollinaris of Laodicea preserved in a catena. This book of the Assumption of Moses appears to have obtained some circulation in the Christian Church. It is cited by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 15, p. 806); by Origen (*in Lib. Jesu Nav. Hom.* ii. 1); by Evodius, a correspondent of Augustine's (Augustine, *Epist.* 158, *opp.* ii. 561); and by Gelasius of Cyzicus (*Acta Syn. Nic.* Mansi, *Concil.* ii. 844, 858). It is enumerated among Old Testament apocrypha in the synopsis of the pseudo-Athanasius; and it is included in the stichometry of Nicephorus, who assigns it the same length (1400 στίχοι) as the Apocalypse of St. John. Nevertheless it had almost entirely perished, when, in 1861, a large fragment of a Latin version of it was recovered and published by Ceriani, from a palimpsest in the Ambrosian Library of Milan. From what we learn from Nicephorus as to the length of the original, we know that the recovered portion is not more than one-third of it; and it is in a very imperfect state, many words or letters being obliterated.* The recovered fragment has been edited by Hilgenfeld in his *Nov. Test. extra Canon. recept.*; and he has attempted to restore the Greek in his *Messias Judæorum*. You can also very conveniently find it in Fritzsche's edition of the Old Testament apocryphal books. Critics have drawn from the fragment different theories as to the date of the book; but it appears to me that the data are altogether insufficient to warrant any certain conclusion. The fragment, unfortunately, breaks off before the death of Moses, so that we have not the means of verifying that the work related a dispute between the Devil and the Archangel Michael. But I do not think we are warranted in rejecting the early testimony that this book was the authority used by Jude, since what he refers to is certainly not found in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament.

* The recovered fragment wants the title; but the citation of Gelasius enables us to be certain in identifying it. The passage cited describes Moses as τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτης, a phase which it is interesting to compare with Gal. iii. 19, Heb. viii. 6.

The second passage is the quotation (*v.* 14) of the words of Enoch. I have already said that Tertullian mentions a Book of Enoch, which in his opinion ought to be received, notwithstanding that it had not been admitted into the Canon of the Jews, who reject this, as they usually do what speaks of Christ. Among Christian writers Tertullian stands alone in this acceptance. Origen (*Hom. in Numer.* xxviii. 2) and Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 38, a passage which deserves to be consulted) mention without disapproval the rejection of it by the Jews. The book was known to Irenæus (IV. xvi. 2), Clement of Alexandria (*Eclog.* ii. p. 990), Anatolius (Euseb. vii. 32), Origen (*De Princip.* iv. 35, *Adv. Cels.* v. 35): see also *Constt. Apost.* vi. 30. Several extracts from the book were preserved by Georgius Syncellus, a monk of Constantinople, towards the end of the eighth century. In these passages the story is told, founded on Gen. vi. 1, of a descent of angels to this lower world, where they became the parents of the giants. The same story appears in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii. 5), and in both forms of the pseudo-Clementines, possibly derived from this source; and it may also be referred to in Jude 6.

Beyond the extracts just mentioned the book had been completely lost, until, in 1773, the traveller Bruce brought back from Abyssinia copies of an Ethiopic version of the Book of Enoch. Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel, published an English translation of this in 1821 (republished, London, 1883), followed by the Ethiopic text in 1838, and this text has been re-edited with a German translation by Dillmann in 1853. It would be out of place here if I were to give a description of the book, or to enter into discussions concerning its date or its unity of authorship. Suffice it to say that there is no reason for doubting that the book is quite old enough to have been used by the Apostle Jude;* and that it contains, with very trifling variations, the words quoted by Jude. Some respectable divines have maintained, notwithstanding, that Jude did not derive hence his knowledge of Enoch's prophecy,

* I believe this to be the opinion of all critics but Volkmar, who assigns a late date to the epistle of Jude, and with this object strives to push down both the Assumption of Moses and the Book of Enoch to the reign of Hadrian.

but that it had been preserved traditionally, and afterwards incorporated in the Book of Enoch. And it has been suggested that the words now found in the Ethiopic version were introduced from Jude by the translator, or had previously been interpolated by a Christian into the Greek. I do not feel that I can with candour take this line.* We can feel no surprise that an Apostle should be acquainted with the Jewish literature current in his age; but it is, no doubt, natural to us to think that God would supernaturally enlighten him so as to prevent his being deceived by a falsely ascribed book; and that if he referred to such a book at all he would take care to make it plain to his readers that he attributed to it no authority. Yet we follow a very unsafe method if we begin by deciding in what way it seems to us most fitting that God should guide His Church, and then try to wrest facts into conformity with our pre-conceptions.†

---

* In the first place, observe the close agreement of the passage formally quoted: 'Behold he comes with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against him' (Enoch *ch.* 2, Laurence's translation). But there are, besides, between the two books, other coincidences to which my attention has been called by Mr. Garrett. Thus, Jude's 'reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day' clearly has its origin in Enoch x. 6–9 (see also v. 16), 'Bind Azazel hand and foot, . . . covering him with darkness; there shall he remain for ever, covering his face that he see not the light; and in the great day of Judgment let him be cast into the fire.' The 'wandering stars' of Jude 13 may be compared with what Enoch tells, xviii. 15, of the 'prison of stars;' and xxi. 3, of stars which have transgressed the commandment of the Most High.' And the words of Enoch xxvi. 2, 3, 'Here shall be collected all who utter with their mouths unbecoming language against God, and speak harsh things of his glory. In the latter days an example shall be made of them in righteousness before the saints,' seem to have suggested the *δεῖγμα* of Jude 7, as well as the *κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν* of *v.* 8. See also *v.* 16.

† It has been already stated (p. 515) that the Peshitto version only contained three Catholic Epistles. The remaining four, viz. Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, were first printed in Syriac, by Pococke, in 1630, from a sixteenth-century MS. in the Bodleian, and were afterwards included in the Paris Polyglot, followed by Walton's and by most subsequent editions. But the evidence, both external and internal, forbids us to assign to this version an earlier date than the sixth century. Of the copies of these Epistles in Syriac (a dozen or more), which have come to light since Pococke's time, the oldest is one of the Nitrian collection in the British Museum, which was written in the ninth century. They are probably part of the translation made about A.D. 508, under the authority of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabug, by Polycarpus, a chorepiscopus.

XXV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

WHEN I pointed out, at the beginning of the last lecture, that we had no right to be surprised if it should appear that, in respect of historical attestation, all the books of our Canon do not stand on the same level, I had chiefly in my mind the book on the discussion of which we are now about to enter—the Second Epistle of Peter. The framers of the Sixth Article of our Church use language which, if strictly understood, implies that there never had been any doubt in the Church concerning the authority of any of the books of Old or New Testament which they admitted into their Canon. Their language would have been more accurate if they had said that they rejected those books concerning whose authority there always had been doubt in the Church. They had, no doubt, principally in view the apocryphal books of the Old Testament; and these books, not included in the Jewish Canon, were not only rejected by many learned men in the earliest ages of the Church, but the doubts concerning them were never permitted to be forgotten; for Jerome's prefaces, which stated their inferiority of authority, constantly continued to circulate side by side with the books themselves. At the time when our Articles were drawn up there was no serious controversy concerning the books of the New Testament, nor had there been any for some centuries before. But you will have seen that it would not be true to assert that there *never* had been controversy. Unfavourable opinions with respect to 2 Peter are expressed by Eusebius and Jerome.* There

* Τὴν δὲ φερομένην Πέτρου δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν· ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν (Euseb. iii. 3).

Simon Petrus . . . scripsit duas Epistolas quæ canonicæ [Catholicæ] nominantur; quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam (Hieron. *De Viris Illust.* 1).

were four of the Catholic Epistles which the early Syrian Church did not receive into its Canon, and a fifth which was not universally received elsewhere. Traces of this diversity of opinion are to be found for some time, and especially where Syrian influence prevailed. Chrysostom, the great preacher of Antioch, never uses any of the four Epistles not included in the Peshitto;* and I believe that the same may be said of Theodoret. Just towards the close of the first half of the sixth century, Junilius, a high legal official in the court of Justinian, turned into Latin, for the benefit of some African bishops† who were his friends, a tract on the Scriptures by Paulus, a distinguished teacher of Nisibis, at that time a centre of Eastern theological education. In this tract books are divided into three classes, 'perfectæ,' 'mediæ,' and 'nullius auctoritatis': the first being those which he sets down absolutely as canonical, the second those which he states 'adjungi a pluribus.' In the first class he has fourteen Epistles of St. Paul (the Hebrews being last mentioned), 'beati Petri ad gentes prima, et beati Johannis prima.' Then in the second class, 'adjungunt quam plurimi quinque alias, id est Jacobi, secundam Petri,' &c. Kihn shows that the exclusion of James, as well as of the other four, was derived from Theodore of Mopsuestia. Junilius himself (ii. 17) quotes 2 Pet. ii. 4 as the words of blessed Peter without any sign of doubt. The tract of Junilius became speedily known to Cassiodorus, and thenceforward had considerable circulation in the West. So late as the beginning of the fourteenth century, Ebed Jesu, a Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis, has only three Catholic Epistles in his New Testament Canon (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III. 9).

* The solitary instance adduced to prove his acquaintance with 2 Pet. ii. 22, ἔοικεν τῷ κυνὶ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἔμετον ἐπανιόντι (*in Joann. Hom.* xxxiv. 3), is really derived from Prov. xxvi. 11, the word in 2 Peter being ἐξέραμα, not ἔμετον. The same proverb, also with ἔμετον, is the only apparent sign of acquaintance with the four Epistles I find in the index to Theodoret (*In Dan.* iii. 1). But Chrysostom's friend, Basil, uses 2 Peter (*adv. Eunom.* v. 1); and we are bound to remember that the absence of quotations may be explained by the fact that, of the four Epistles in question, three are extremely short, and the fourth not very long.

† Consequently, Junilius has commonly passed for an African bishop himself, until his true history was tracked out by Kihn (*Theodor von Mopsuestia*, 1880).

Notwithstanding isolated expressions of dissent, the general voice of the Church accepted all seven Catholic Epistles; and this verdict remained undisturbed until the revival of learning. Then Erasmus on the one hand, Calvin on the other, express doubts as to 2 Peter. The latter, in the preface to his Commentary, shows himself much impressed by what Jerome had remarked as to difference of style from that of the First Epistle, as well as by other considerations leading him to think Peter not the author. But he says that, if the Epistle is canonical at all, Petrine authorship in some sense must be acknowledged, since the Epistle plainly claims it. And 'since the majesty of the Spirit of Christ exhibits itself in every part of the Epistle,' he scruples to reject it, though not recognizing in it the genuine language of Peter. He is therefore disposed to believe that it may have been written, at Peter's command, by one of his disciples. And this is almost precisely the line taken by Erasmus. Later critics have taken even a more unfavourable view of the Epistle; and at the present day it is generally rejected even by the less extreme critics of the sceptical school, while its cause has been abandoned by some within our own Church.

I am not prepared to condemn those who do not pretend to have a stronger assurance of the genuineness of the book than had Eusebius and Jerome; but I may point out that its authority can well stand notwithstanding the fact that these eminent critics entertained doubts of it. We have just seen that to have been subject to early doubts is a lot which 2 Peter shares in common with four other of the Catholic Epistles; and yet, as respects them, we have found reason to think, not that the case for these Epistles was bad, but that the scrutiny to which they were subjected was very severe. With respect to early attestation, the case for the Epistle of James is little stronger than that for 2 Peter, yet I count that its authority cannot be reasonably impugned. I feel no doubt that the two minor Epistles of St. John come from the same hand as the First; though if we referred the matter to the judgment of early critics the decision might turn out the other way. The evidence of early recognition of Peter's Second Epistle is certainly weaker than in the case of most

other New Testament books. Yet it is by no means inconsiderable; and at the beginning of this course of lectures I remarked how many classical books there are as to the genuineness of which we feel no doubt, notwithstanding the impossibility of giving proof of early recognition.

By the fifth century the authority of the seven Catholic Epistles, including 2 Peter, was acknowledged throughout the greater part of the Christian world; and I believe this to be true of the fourth century also; for I think that Eusebius and Jerome only express the closet doubts of learned men, and not popular Church opinion. In Jerome's case, what we know of his method of composition gives us reason to believe that he is rather repeating what he had read than stating the belief of his own time, or even his own deliberate opinion. For he elsewhere speaks of the Epistle without any doubt of its authorship (*Ep.* 53, *ad Paulin. de stud. script.*):* and he offers the suggestion that the difference of style between the two Epistles might be accounted for by Peter's having used different interpreters† (*Epist.* 120, *ad Hedibiam*, *Quæst.* xi.). Jerome's friend Epiphanius uses the Epistle without doubt‡ (*Haer.* lxvi. 65). Didymus, the blind head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, has left a Commentary on the Catholic Epistles, preserved in Latin by Cassiodorus, all through which 2 Peter appears to be treated as possessing full canonical authority, until in the very last sentence we are surprised to read, 'Non est igitur ignorandum præsentem epistolam esse falsatam, quæ licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est.' Some doubt is cast on this clause by the fact that in the work *De Trinitate*, which appears to be rightly ascribed to Didymus, he ten times quotes our Epistle as Peter's, without note of doubt (see I. xv. p. 303, Migne, and the passages referred to

* The prologue to the Catholic Epistles, printed as Jerome's, is not genuine.

† It is natural to set down Mark as one of them, and it has been conjectured that Glaucias may have been the other; but this suggestion is derived from an authority not entitled to much respect, namely, the heretic Basilides, who claimed to have received traditions from an interpreter of Peter so called (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 17).

‡ Quoting it with the formula Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, which, when used by earlier writers in a citation from the First Epistle, is commonly taken for an implied rejection of the Second.

in Mingarelli's note). But the clause has all the marks of being a translation from the Greek. 'Non est ignorandum epistolam esse falsatam,' probably represents, *ἰστέον ὡς νοθεύεται ἡ ἐπιστολή* (see Eus. ii. 23), and merely means that the genuineness of the Epistle was disputed.

That the opinion of Eusebius was unfavourable cannot be denied; but I believe that he, too, is but echoing the doubts of predecessors. We have every reason to think that in his own time the current of opinion ran strongly in favour of the Epistle. On the establishment of Christianity by Constantine, an active multiplication of copies of the Scriptures became necessary, both in order to repair the losses suffered under the Diocletian persecution, and to provide for the wants of the many new converts. And all the evidence we can draw, whether from existing MSS.,* or from ancient catalogues of the books of Scripture, goes to make it probable that wherever the production of a complete Bible was intended, it included the collection of seven Catholic Epistles, the existence of which Eusebius himself recognizes. These seven were owned as canonical by Athanasius and by Cyril of Jerusalem, both younger contemporaries of Eusebius.

Among the predecessors whose opinion had most weight with Eusebius was Origen, who (in a passage cited p. 290) attests both that the book was known in his time, and that its genuineness was disputed. I have remarked that Origen's immediate purpose in that passage would lead him to present the least favourable view of the genuineness of disputed books. In several places elsewhere Origen quotes 2 Peter without expression of doubt. It is true these quotations are all found in works only known to us through the Latin translation of Rufinus, whose faithfulness cannot be depended on; but, on examination of the passages, it does not seem to me likely

* The two earliest existing MSS., which probably are as early as the reign of Constantine, both include the seven Catholic Epistles. So does the Claromontane list, the original of which Westcott believes to be as old as the third century. In Codex B (where, as is customary, the Catholic Epistles follow the Acts) there is a twofold division of sections, an older and a later. In 2 Peter alone the older division of sections is wanting; from which it may be inferred that this Epistle was wanting in an ancestor of the Vatican MS.

that Rufinus could have invented them; and I believe the truth to be, that Origen in popular addresses did not think it necessary to speak with scientific accuracy. It is implied in this solution that Peter's authorship was the popular belief of Origen's time; and this is made probable to me by the fact that Origen's contemporary, Firmilian of Cappadocia, writing to Cyprian (Cyprian, *Ep.* 75), speaks of Peter as having execrated heretics, and warned us to avoid them, words which can only refer to the Second Epistle. We can produce no evidence of knowledge of the Epistle from the writings of Cyprian himself, nor from those of his predecessor Tertullian. I have mentioned (p. 478) that the Muratorian Fragment does not notice the Second Epistle, but that its equal silence concerning the First makes us unable to build an argument on this omission. But that 2 Peter did not form part of the earliest Canon of the Latin Church appears probable from the fact that it was not translated by the same hand as other of the Catholic Epistles. The same Greek words in 1 Peter and 2 Peter are rendered differently; as also the same words in the parallel places of 2 Peter and Jude.*

I must leave it undetermined whether or not Clement of Alexandria used the Epistle. When we have the testimony of Eusebius and of Photius (see p. 493) that Clement wrote comments on the Catholic Epistles, we seem to have no warrant for treating this as a loose way of stating that he commented only on some of them. Accordingly, Hilgenfeld and Davidson, although they both reject 2 Peter, yet believe that Clement commented on it; and Davidson suggests that Cassiodorus may have only been in possession of extracts from Clement's *Hypotyposeis*. But since I find in Clement's other writings no proofs of acquaintance with the two Epistles which Cassiodorus leaves out, I do not venture to assert positively that Clement's comments included these two Epistles.

Irenæus makes no express mention of 2 Peter, and he

* The evidence will be found in Westcott (*N. T. Canon*, p. 261). We have no Latin MSS. containing a pre-Hieronymian text of 2 Peter; nor indeed of any of the Catholic Epistles except James, and a small fragment of 3 John. The remark above applies to the Vulgate, the text of which no doubt represents an earlier translation merely revised by Jerome.

seems to exclude it by the phrase 'in epistola sua' (IV. ix. 2), when he speaks of the First Epistle; but he has one or two coincidences with the Second, which require examination. And first we have twice 'The day of the Lord is as it were a thousand years' (v. xxiii. 2, and xxviii. 3), words which recall 2 Peter iii. 8. But whatever may have been the ultimate source of this saying, it seems to me that in neither case was Peter the immediate source from which Irenæus took it. In the first passage Irenæus reproduces an explanation by which Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 81) reconciles the long life of Adam with the threat, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' The words in Irenæus are exactly the same as in Justin, *ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη*, not as in Peter, *μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χ. ἔ.*; and the use Irenæus makes of the words being the same as in Justin, and not as in Peter, the former is clearly the immediate source of the quotation. In the second passage Irenæus expounds the statement in Genesis that God completed His works in six days, as not merely a history of the past, but a prophecy of the future, intimating that the world was to last 6000 years, the day of the Lord being as 1000 years. The maxim is quoted in Justin's form, but the exposition had already been given by Barnabas (*c.* 15); and on comparing the passages it seems to me probable that it was to Barnabas Irenæus was indebted for it. But though this maxim decides nothing as to Irenæus's knowledge of 2 Peter, it would be still more to the point if it showed that two earlier writers were acquainted with the Epistle. There is nothing to show whence Justin derived what he calls *τὸ εἰρημένον*;* but Barnabas enunciates the principle, 'a day with him is a thousand years,' not as a quotation, but as a maxim of his own. And in proof of it he adduces *αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων· Ἰδοὺ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς χ. ἔ.* This is clearly meant for a quotation of Ps. xc. 4; so that I fail to find evidence here of the antiquity of 2 Peter.†

* In favour of the Petrine origin may be noticed that in the next chapter Justin has words which recall 2 Peter ii. 1, *ὕνπερ δὲ τρόπον καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐπὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν γενομένων ἁγίων προφητῶν ἦσαν, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν νῦν πολλοί εἰσι καὶ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.*

† It must be borne in mind that Rabbinical writers (see Schöttgen, *Horæ Heb. et Talmud.* I. 1052, ii. 497) have both the intepretations used by

The warnings drawn in succession from the history of Noah, and from that of Lot in Iren. IV. xxxvi. 3, have been thought to be an echo of 2 Peter ii. 5–8; but it seems to me that Irenæus does no more than comment on Luke xvii. 26–31. I am much more struck by the coincidence that in speaking of the death of Peter (iii. 1), Irenæus uses the word ἔξοδος employed by Peter himself (2 Peter i. 15). Some carry the argument further, and contend that the author of 2 Peter is proved to be the Apostle, because, when speaking of the Transfiguration, he uses the word 'tabernacle' in immediate connexion with ἔξοδος, which is found in the same context (Luke ix. 31, 33). In this latter part of the argument I see no force, for it might as well be adduced to prove that the author of 2 Peter derived his knowledge of the Transfiguration from having read the Gospel of St. Luke. It is not certain whether in the passage of Irenæus we are to render ἔξοδος 'decease' or 'departure' [from Rome]; but undoubtedly the word ἔξοδος came very early into the Christian vocabulary, expressing as it does the doctrine that death is no more than removal to another scene. We have, for instance, *τὰ μαρτύρια τῆς ἐξόδου αὐτῶν* in the history of the martyrdoms at Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. v. 1); and further on *ἀγαλλιωμένη ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξόδῳ* and *ἐπισφραγισάμενος αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ἐξόδου τὴν μαρτυρίαν*. The word ἔξοδος occurs in the same sense in one of the best known passages of the Book of Wisdom (iii. 2); it is used in the same way both by Philo and Josephus, and you will find in Wetstein's notes on Luke ix. 31 a host of illustrations of the use of the word 'exitus' for death, by Latin heathen writers. I feel, therefore, that it is precarious to build any argument on the use of so common a word; and, consequently, I cannot rely on any of the proofs that have been supposed to show Irenæus's acquaintance with our Epistle.

On the other hand, there is a passage in the Clementine Recognitions (v. 12) which I have not seen noticed. We have only the Latin of the Recognitions; but 'unusquisque illius

Barnabas and by Justin. We have, therefore, to choose whether we shall hold that the Jews derived these from the Christian Church, or shall admit that Barnabas may have derived his principle from a source different from 2 Peter.

fit servus cui se ipse subjecerit' looks very like the translation of ᾧ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται (2 Peter ii. 19).* Rufinus is the translator, and in one of his translations from Origen (*In Exod. Hom.* 12) we have 'unusquisque a quo vincitur, huic et servus addicitur.' The difference of the Latin makes it likely that in both cases Rufinus is translating, not interpolating.† Theophilus of Antioch, who died a little after 180, has a coincidence (*ad Autol.* ii. 13) with Peter's 'light shining in a dark place' (i. 19). The words in Theophilus are, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ; while Peter describes the 'prophetic word' as λύχνος φαίνων ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ; and these words in Peter may have been suggested by 2 Esdras xii. 42, 'sicut lucerna in loco obscuro,' unless the obligation is the other way. This passage by itself would yield but doubtful evidence; but I am led to believe that it indicates a use of Peter by Theophilus, because close at hand there is another coincidence, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι (*ad Autol.* ii. 9): ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι (2 Peter i. 21). There also is a parallel to this last verse in Hippolytus (*De Antechristo*, 2), but the resemblance is not close enough to be decisive.

Before the end of the second century the doctrine of the future destruction of the world by fire had become an established and notorious point of Christian belief. The heathen disputant in Minucius Felix (*c.* 10) says of the Christians: 'toto orbi et ipsi mundo cum sideribus suis minantur incendium.' Tatian (*Or. ad Gr.* 25), deriving his doctrine from Justin (*Apol.* ii. 7), contrasts his Christian belief with that of the Stoics; he holding, in opposition to them, that the world was to be dissolved, and the ἐκπύρωσις to take place —not κατὰ καιρούς, but εἰσάπαξ. It is interesting to inquire whence, except from 2 Peter iii. 10–12, the Christians learned the doctrine. It is, indeed, found in the Sibylline Oracles

* The words are much nearer to Peter than either to John viii. 34, or Rom. vi. 16.

† Dr. Quarry has pointed out to me that in the Clementine Homilies (xix. 20) τοὐναντίον μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ taken in connexion with the whole context, there is very probably a use of 2 Peter iii. 9.

(iii. 83–87; see also ii. 196, vi. 118); but it was not a general article of Jewish belief; for Philo, in his treatise '*De Incorruptibilitate Mundi*,' argues strongly against the notion, not as a Jewish, but as a Stoic one, that one element could swallow up the other three. Many parts of the Canonical Scriptures speak of fire as the future punishment of the wicked; but I do not remember any other place where it is said that the whole world itself shall be burned up. Now, Dr. Gwynn has pointed out what I believe to be a real use of 2 Peter in 2 Clement 16: *ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος, καὶ τακήσονταί τινες τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλιβος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* The Old Testament passages here employed (Mal. iv. 1, Is. xxxiv. 4) would not suggest a burning up of the world to one not familiar with the doctrine before. But it is the last clause which seems to establish a use of 2 Peter. There, after phrases nearly identical with *πυρὶ τηκόμενος*, we have, according to the best attested reading, *γῆ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται.* The last word has puzzled interpreters and transcribers; but it seems to me probable that 2 Clement so read 2 Peter, and that he explains the clause by *τότε φανήσεται τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

There are phrases both in Clement of Rome and in Hermas which recall 2 Peter (for instance, *μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα*, 2 Pet. i. 17, Clem. ix.); but in neither case can we be sure that the coincidence is more than accidental. On a review of the whole external evidence we find clear proof that 2 Peter was in use early in the third century. With regard to second century testimony, the maintainers and the opponents of the genuineness of the Epistle make it a drawn battle. There is no case of quotation so certain as to constrain the acknowledgment of an opponent; but there are probable instances of the use of the Epistle in sufficient numbers to invalidate any argument against the Epistle drawn from the silence of early writers. But on comparing the evidence for the First and Second Epistles we have to own, however we are to account for it, that for a considerable time the latter had a much narrower circulation than the former, and was much slower in obtaining general recognition.

Grotius suggested as an explanation of this difference that our Epistle was written, not by Peter the Apostle, but by Symeon, who succeeded James as Bishop of Jerusalem. It is to be remarked that, whereas the First Epistle begins 'Peter,' the Second begins 'Symeon [or Simon] Peter.' This has been made an argument against the genuineness of the Epistle; but the opposite inference is more natural. For the writer of the Second Epistle knew of the First (iii. 1); and if he were a forger, it is surprising that he should not conform to the model he had in his hands; and when professing to write to the same people, should neither copy the address of the former Epistle, nor even write the Apostle's name the same way. This point deserves to be borne in mind when coincidences between the two Epistles are explained as arising from designed imitation on the part of the writer of the Second. For if this writer were a forger, he was certainly a very careless one, who took little pains to give probability to his work by imitation of the genuine work in his possession. But, to return to the conjecture of Grotius. This cannot be upheld, unless we combine it with arbitrary and unwarrantable changes in the text of the document we are considering. For nothing can be plainer than that the document, as it stands, professes to come from Peter the Apostle. Not merely does the author call himself Peter in his salutation: he professes to have been a witness to the Transfiguration (i. 18); he claims to be the author of the First Epistle (iii. 1); he sets himself on a level with Paul (iii. 15); and he refers (i. 14) to his death as foretold by our Lord, this being probably an allusion to His words recorded John xxi. 18.

It has been made an objection to the genuineness of the Epistle, that the writer should betray such anxiety to identify himself with the Apostle. On the other hand, it has been replied with perfect truth, that this Epistle puts nothing into the mouth of Peter which the Apostle might not naturally have said in a real letter. I am disposed to attribute this much weight to the objection that, though it yields no argument against the genuineness, it deprives us of an argument for it. In the case of most New Testament books, when we test by internal evidence the traditional account of their

authorship, we find reason to conclude that the documents are both like what might have been written by the reputed authors, and very unlike the work of a forger. In the present case we must own that a forger, no doubt, would be likely to take pains to make the Petrine authorship plain; but it would be absurd to deny that Peter himself might also leave on his work plain traces of his authorship. As for the reference to Paul; since we have seen that Peter in his First Epistle makes silent use of Pauline letters, there is nothing strange in his mentioning them by name in the Second.

It will seem to many that at the point at which we have now arrived our inquiry might well close. For if we proceed we are brought to a very painful alternative. In the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we can treat its authorship as an open question, notwithstanding that it has so long passed in the Church as Paul's, and that the Liturgy of our own Church recognizes the claim. For that Epistle itself does not profess to be Paul's, so that we can believe those to be mistaken who took the work for his, and yet impute no dishonesty to the author. But here we have only the choice to regard the Epistle as the work of Peter, or else as the production of a forger, who hoped to gain credit for his work by dishonestly affixing to it the Apostle's name. Some who impugn the Petrine authorship desire to let us down gently, and deprecate the employment of the word 'forger,' overtaxing the resources of the English language to find some name, 'pseudepigrapher,' or 'falsarius,' which shall sound less harshly. But I must call a spade a spade. Macaulay is not to be called a forger, though he gives the title 'The prophecy of Capys' to a prediction which Capys never delivered. But where there is intention to deceive, forgery is the proper word. I do not deny that a fault may be less deserving of censure if committed by one of lower moral culture. The man who thinks a pious fraud permissible may deserve to be beaten with fewer stripes than he who acts against his conscience in committing it. Whoever the author of this Epistle was, he was clearly a pious and orthodox man; and if he was a forger, we can discern no motive for the forgery but that of supporting the disciples under the trial to their faith caused by the delay of

their Master's promised coming. In the case supposed, therefore, we can judge with all leniency of the author; but I am sure he would have been much ashamed if he had been found out at the time, and would have fared no better than the presbyter who was deposed for forging the Acts of Paul and Thecla (see p. 357). The use of gentle language, then, will do little to mitigate the pain we must feel, if what we have been accustomed to regard as the utterances of an inspired Apostle should turn out to be the work of one for whom our merciful consideration must be implored, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Christian duty of absolute truthfulness.

To many the question will seem to be settled by a *reductio ad absurdum*, when it has been pointed out that the rejection of the Petrine authorship obliges us to believe that the Church has been for centuries deceived by a false pretence to inspiration. But as I have undertaken to make a historical investigation, in the same manner as if we were making a critical inquiry into the authorship of any classical writings, my plan precludes me from assuming that the Church could make no mistake in such a matter. And indeed it would evidently require longer discussions than can be here entered into before we could establish the principle proposed to be assumed or ascertain its necessary limitations. Anyone who uses the Revised New Testament must reject a good deal of what has been long accepted as inspired. To many pious men of old it seemed a shocking thing when the divine inspiration was denied of the Greek Old Testament, which the Apostles had committed to the Church. We do not receive the decisions on the Canon made at Carthage or at Trent, not believing that the opinions as to the authority of Greek and Hebrew books, expressed by men who had little or no knowledge of the languages in which they were written, can become binding on us by the fact that they have been accepted by men equally unlearned. And our acceptance or rejection of the Apocalypse does not depend on our ascertaining whether or not the book was included in the Canon of Laodicea. If it seem to us that God must have miraculously interfered in the fifth century, had it been then necessary, in

order to prevent an uninspired book from being accepted as inspired, there seems an equal necessity for miraculous interference in the two previous centuries to prevent an inspired book from being rejected as spurious, by men whose souls were as dear to God as those of their posterity. I confess my inability to find out by the 'high priori road' in what way God must deal with His Church; and I have faith to believe that the course by which He has actually guided her will prove to be right, even though it do not agree with our preconceptions.

Proceeding, then, with the inquiry, we have to notice the use made of Jude's Epistle. The coincidences between the second chapter of 2 Peter and the Epistle of Jude are so numerous, that it is beyond dispute that the one writer used the work of the other. I have carefully read the very able argument by which Professor Lumby, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, maintains the priority of Peter's Epistle. But I am unconvinced by it, and adhere to the opinion of the great majority of critics, that the priority rests with Jude. To take but one example: instead of regarding the verse in which Jude speaks about the body of Moses to be, as Professor Lumby holds, an expansion of the corresponding verse in Peter, I think the latter verse is scarcely intelligible if we had not in Jude the explanation what was referred to. But is there anything inadmissible in the supposition that one Apostle should use the work of another? I have already observed that Peter in his First Epistle certainly uses the Epistle to the Romans, a work which we need not doubt was in his readers' hands. Why should he not here make still larger employment of Jude's Epistle, a work which (as we may infer from the copiousness of his use) he judged to be not likely to be known to his readers. In early times there was far less scruple about unacknowledged borrowing than at the present day. At the present day, indeed, in addresses not intended to go beyond the immediate audience, a speaker has not much scruple in using words not his own if they best express his ideas, and if they are not likely to be familiar to his hearers. Before the invention of printing, each writer must have felt himself to be addressing a circle nearly as limited

as that addressed by a preacher of the present day, and could not count that things he had read himself would be likely to be known to his readers also. And since an Apostle's letters were not prompted by vanity of authorship, but by anxiety to impress certain lessons on his readers, I do not see why he should have thought himself bound to abstain from using the words of another, if they seemed to him most likely to make the impression he desired.* But what strikes me as really remarkable is the great freedom with which Peter uses the work of his predecessor. In some places we might imagine that the two writers were translating independently from the same Aramaic, if the coincidences in the Greek of other places did not exclude that supposition. The variations are at times so considerable as to make us doubt whether Peter could have had Jude's Epistle before him when he was writing. And the idea even occurs whether it may not possibly be that Peter was writing from recollection, not of what he had read, but of what he had heard. I may mention one difference between the parallel passages in Jude and in 2 Peter, that whereas in the latter the censures are plainly directed against false teachers, this is not clearly so in Jude, where, for all that appears, the objects of censure may be only men of corrupt heart who somehow had found their way into the Church, but whose immoral lives showed that they ought never to have been admitted (see p. 525).

I come now to the objection noticed by Jerome, founded on the difference of style between the two Petrine Epistles. And it must be admitted that such a difference exists. It does not count for much that the Second Epistle contains many unusual words, for it has not more than its fair proportion of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. Leusden† counts 1686 in the whole N. T., or about one word in three; for he computes the whole vocabulary as limited to 4956 words. Of these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, there are fifty-eight in 1 Peter, and forty-eight in 2 Peter, numbers which fairly correspond to the lengths of the two Epistles. But the following points of dissimilarity have been

* The identity of certain portions of the prophecies of Isaiah and of Micah is a fact of the same kind.

† *Compendium Græcum N. T.* (Preface).

noted: (*a*) the Second Epistle differs from the First in fondness for repetitions of words and phrases: thus, δωρέομαι, i. 3, 4; ἀπώλεια, ii. 1 (bis), 3, iii. 7, 16; δίκαιος, i. 13, ii. 7, 8 (bis); φθορά, φθείρειν, i. 4, ii. 12 (ter.), 19; προσδοκᾶν, iii. 12, 13, 14; σπουδή, σπουδάζειν, i. 5, 10, 15, iii. 14; μισθὸς ἀδικίας, ii. 13, 15. (*b*) The particles connecting the sentences are different, particles such as ἵνα, ὅτι, οὖν, μέν, which are common in the First being rare in the Second, in which we find instead sentences introduced with τοῦτο, or ταῦτα: see i. 8, 10; iii. 11, 14. (*c*) A use of ὡς, which is common in the First Epistle (i. 13, 19, ii. 2, &c.), is rare in the Second; where, on the other hand, we have a common formation of a subordinate clause with the preposition ἐν and a substantive (*e.g.* τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, i. 4), of which there is but one doubtful instance (i. 14) in the First Epistle. (*d*) The First Epistle makes much more use of the Old Testament language. In Westcott and Hort's table (ii. 180) are enumerated thirty-one O. T. quotations in 1 Peter, but only five in 2 Peter, and these disputable. (*e*) Σωτήρ is frequently used in 2 Peter as a title of our Lord, παρουσία, of his second coming, the word ἐπίγνωσις is common, &c., none of which words occur in 1 Peter. But in these instances the usage of 2 Peter well agrees with that of the Pauline Epistles, and we have seen that the use of Pauline diction is a characteristic of the First Epistle. With respect to the paucity of Old Testament quotations, it may be observed that there are no such quotations in St. John's First Epistle, though it is admittedly by the same hand as the Gospel, which quotes the Old Testament largely.

On the other hand, Professor Lumby brings out with great ability, in an argument which will not bear abridgment, the features of resemblance between the two Epistles (*Speaker's Commentary*, p. 228); see also Davidson, ii. 462, from whose list of coincidences I take the following: ἀρετή, of God (1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3); ἀπόθεσις (1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 14); ἄσπιλος καὶ ἄμωμος (1 Pet. i. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 14: see also 2 Pet. ii. 13); ἐποπτεύειν, ἐπόπτης (1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 16); πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (1 Pet. iv. 1: *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 14). None of the above words or combinations occurs elsewhere in N. T.* When it

* In addition to the above, the salutation χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυν-

is proposed to account for these resemblances by the fact that the author of the Second Epistle was confessedly acquainted with the First, we must bear in mind what has been already said as to his little solicitude about designed imitation. It is to be remarked also that these resemblances are not conspicuous, or associated with repetitions in 2 Peter of the ideas of 1 Peter, as they would be if produced by design. And if it is urged that the resemblances are few, there remains St. Jerome's way of accounting for the absence of greater similarity of style between the two letters, viz. that Peter might have employed a different secretary on each occasion.

In this connexion I mention some of the coincidences noted by Professor Lumby (*Speaker's Commentary*, p. 226) between 2 Peter and Peter's speeches in the Acts: λαγχάνω, for 'to obtain' (Acts i. 17; 2 Pet. i. 1); εὐσέβεια, in a peculiar sense (Acts iii. 12; 2 Pet. i. 7); εὐσεβήs (Acts x. 2, 7; 2 Pet. ii. 9); ἄνομα, 'of things' (Acts ii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 8); φθέγγομαι, 'to speak;' (Acts iv. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 16, 18); ἡμέρα κυρίου (Acts ii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 10); μισθὸς τῆς ἀδικίας (Acts i. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15); ἐπάγειν (Acts v. 28; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 5); κολάζεσθαι (Acts iv. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 9). Only one of the above occurs elsewhere in N. T. I add as an indication of early date another coincidence with the Acts—the frequent metaphorical use of ἡ ὁδός (Acts xviii. 25, xix. 9, &c.; 2 Pet. ii. 2, 15, 21).

Dr. Edwin Abbott has founded (*Expositor*, 1882, III. 204), on the style of 2 Peter, a new argument against its Petrine origin. He contends that the style is not only unlike that of the First Epistle, but also in itself so ignoble as to be unworthy of an Apostle. He had met in an Indian newspaper with some choice specimens of 'Baboo' English, in which the author aimed at the use of very fine words, but made himself ridiculous in the attempt by a constant violation of the usages of the language. This suggested to him that the Greek of 2 Peter might be described as 'Baboo' Greek, full of pedantic out-of-the-way words, and of words improperly used; and while

---

θείη is common to the two Petrine Epistles. Jude alone has πληθυνθείη in the salutation; and, if we were forced to choose between the explanations, that the author of 1 Peter used Jude, or that Jude used 2 Peter, the latter explanation seems the more probable.

thus exhibiting an attempt at fine writing, really so barbarous in its style as to be almost unintelligible.* I am not concerned to defend the goodness of the Greek of the Epistle, but we have cause to suspect that Dr. Abbott must have much exaggerated its badness when we find that of the Greek fathers—whether of those who accepted the Epistle, like Athanasius; or of those who rejected it, like Eusebius—none seems to have made the remark that its Greek is absolutely grotesque and ridiculous. In respect of Greek we are all, more or less, Baboos; so that if 2 Peter be written in Baboo Greek, it is odd that it should have been left for a Baboo to find it out.

But if Dr. Abbott had completely proved his case it would have little bearing on the question of the authorship of the Epistle. Those who contend for the Petrine authorship would feel it cost them nothing to admit that Peter was not a good Greek scholar. In fact there are many who have inferred from Papias's mention of Peter's 'interpreter,' that that Apostle did not know Greek at all. Still less difficulty would they have in admitting that Peter's 'interpreter,' though probably possessing sufficient knowledge of Greek for colloquial purposes, was unskilful in the literary use of the language. Everyone writing in a language that is not his own is liable to make mistakes. When he has attained so much proficiency as to be able to avoid offences against grammar, a foreigner will still betray himself by a wrong

* The bulk to which this volume has swelled induces me to abridge a discussion on which I feel that in the former editions I had spent more pages than it was worth; but I then examined with some minuteness Dr. Abbott's proofs of his thesis, and I showed that a number of the words and locutions which he characterized as out-of-the-way or improper are only so as not being found in the Greek books now commonly read in schools, but can be paralleled in the works of later Greek authors. In the course of centuries languages are liable to change, and judgments formed on a thorough knowledge of one period may be quite inapplicable to another. A critic whose knowledge of English had been derived from a study of Addison and Swift, might, if he met a page of Carlyle's, or a poem of Browning's, confidently pronounce it to be the work of a foreigner. And the same style of criticism which Dr. Abbott applies to the Greek of 2 Peter would equally prove that Tertullian had no vernacular knowledge of Latin, and used a vocabulary consisting partly of words of his own invention, partly of phrases pedantically introduced from little-read authors.

vocabulary, from time to time using words in a way that a native would not employ them.

As far, then, as the question of authorship is concerned, the only one of Dr. Abbott's allegations which needs to be attended to is that the Epistle displays such 'ignobility of thought' as to be unworthy an Apostle; but this is sufficiently refuted by the fact that in order to make the Epistle contemptible, Dr. Abbott found it necessary to make a new version of it. We thus see that its faults, if faults there are, lie in the language, not in the thoughts. Done into such English as that of the Authorized Version, we all feel its grandeur and power. But no translation could confer these qualities on it if it were the poor stuff Dr. Abbott thinks it.

It remains to examine a much more serious assault by Dr. Abbott on the Epistle. He undertook to prove (*Expositor*, Jan. 1882) that the writer borrowed from the *Antiquities* of Josephus, a work only published A.D. 93; and, if so, it is clear that the borrower could not be St. Peter. I can honestly say that I am conscious of no prejudice such as would preclude me from giving a candid consideration to Dr. Abbott's proofs. I had no such stubborn belief in the Petrine authorship of the Epistle as would render me incapable of giving a fair hearing to opposing evidence. Though each of the objections brought against the Petrine authorship admitted of an answer, yet their combined effect produced a sensible impression on me; and one difficulty in particular I felt very much. If I am right in thinking that the First Epistle was written after the breaking out of the Neronian persecution, and if St. Peter died during the reign of the same emperor, no very great interval of time could have separated the two Epistles. How is it then that the Second should not only differ a good deal from the First in its style and in its topics—the perils which threatened the Church at the time of the First Epistle seeming to be mainly persecution from without; at that of the Second, corruption from within—but, though addressed to the same people, should differ also in the fate of its reception; the First becoming rapidly known all over the Christian world, the Second so little circulated as apparently

to run some risk of suppression?* We can give conjectural answers to this question; but there remained enough of doubt as to their correctness to make me willing to sympathize with Olshausen, who says: 'Sentio profecto certis argumentis nec genuinam nec adulterinam originem epistolæ posse demonstrari. Rationibus autem subjectivis fultus authentiam epistolæ persuasum habeo.' But subjective reasons must give way to proofs; and Olshausen properly adds, 'nisi res novæ ex historia vel ex indole epistolæ inveniantur ad litem dirimendam aptiores quam hucusque proponebantur.' Such 'res novæ' seemed to be offered by Dr. Abbott; and if his arguments forced me to give up a long-cherished belief, I should at least have the satisfaction of seeing clear light cast on a much-disputed question. I therefore read Dr. Abbott's Paper without having made up my mind beforehand that he must be wrong; and I was much impressed by the case he seemed to make out of a borrowing from Josephus on the part of the writer of our Epistle. It was not until I carefully examined the matter for myself that I arrived at the conviction that Dr. Abbott's discovery was merely that of a mare's nest.

Archdeacon Farrar, indeed, says (*Expositor*, III. 403) that Dr. Abbott has proved 'beyond all shadow of doubt that Josephus and the writer of the Epistle could not have written independently of each other;' and that 'it would be impossible for him to feel respect for the judgment of any critic who asserted that the resemblances between the two writers were purely fortuitous;' and that, 'were the question unconnected with theology, no critic could set aside the facts adduced without being charged with a total absence of the critical faculty.' So he leaves us, as the only way of maintaining the Petrine origin of our Epistle, the not very hopeful line of defence that Josephus borrowed from 2 Peter. It really requires some courage,† in the face of so magisterial a decision, to give

* I may add that the readers of the Second Epistle are assumed to be in possession of a collection of Pauline letters, which would lead us to think of the Epistle as later than the Acts of the Apostles.

† The question is one which must be decided by arguments, not by authorities; but I may mention that I have never had the discomfort of feeling myself quite alone in my opinion. In the first place, the two or three most striking coincidences adduced by Dr. Abbott are stock quota-

utterance to the opposite conclusion at which I myself arrived; but I cannot help thinking that the Archdeacon would have expressed himself less confidently if he had acted on Routh's golden rule, 'Always verify your references.' For anyone who merely looks at the coincidences, as set forth in the clever way in which Dr. Abbott has arranged them, will easily arrive at Archdeacon Farrar's conclusion, that there has been borrowing on one side or the other; but if he goes to Josephus and looks at the passages *in situ*, he finds that one might read them over a dozen times, as for centuries so many have done, without ever being reminded of 2 Peter.*

The first thing that strikes one on a comparison of the passages is, that the alleged coincidences relate entirely to words, and not at all to the thoughts. Josephus and 2 Peter have quite different ideas to express, and what is asserted is, that in doing so they manage to employ several identical words. Now the case is just the reverse, where we have real literary obligation, as in the instance of 2 Peter and Jude. There the imitation is shown chiefly in matter; in words very much less.

---

tions from Josephus, used for the illustration of 2 Peter by commentators who never thought of founding on them a charge of borrowing. Next, I have been allowed to use an unpublished criticism o fDr. Abbott's Paper, by Dr. Quarry, who takes the same view of it that I have done. And he states that his opinion was shared by the late Bishop Fitz Gerald. Through the kindness of Dr. Sanday, I have become acquainted with an able American criticism of Dr. Abbott's Paper, by Dr. Warfield, which appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. And lastly, Dr. Gwynn, who was kind enough to examine into this matter for my assistance, arrived independently at the same conclusions as I had done; and has given me many additional reasons for holding them.

† I am sorry to find from an article in the *Expositor* (Jan. 1888) that Archdeacon Farrar is much hurt by the suggestion that he had not examined the passages *in situ*. I can only say that the suggestion was not unkindly or insincerely made. I thought too well of his critical ability to believe it to be possible that if he had carefully looked into the matter he could have made the assertions, the erroneousness of which I expose on the next page. On the other hand, an error of haste seemed to me very probable; for my admiration of the high qualities of the Archdeacon's work is constantly tempered by the reflection, how much still better the work might have been if the author had only taken a little more pains with it and spent a little more time on it. Indeed a plausible case might be made out that Archdeacon Farrar had not taken the trouble of reading the pages of this book which he undertakes to answer; for he so completely ignores all my arguments that I now find nothing more necessary in the way of reply than to reprint without alteration what I had said.

But Archdeacon Farrar states that the two documents have in common 'words in some instances not only unusual but startling, words which are in some instances *hapax legomena*, occurring together in much the same sequence and connexion in passages of brief compass.' On all these points I take issue with him.

(1) They do not occur in passages of what I should call 'brief compass.' The words common which come so close together in Dr. Abbott's report of the evidence lie well apart in the respective authors. Dr. Abbott gives a list of thirteen words common; but these are taken from a folio page of Josephus, and range from i. 3, to iii. 16, in 2 Peter.

(2) They are not 'in the same sequence and connexion.' The words common which Dr. Abbott letters from *a* to *h* appear in Josephus in the order, *a*, *g*, *f*, *b*, *h*, *c*, *d*, *e*; in 2 Peter in the order, *g*, *c*, *d*, *b*, *h*, *e*, *f*, *a*. The case, then, is as if one finding two pieces of stuff of different patterns and material should fix on some flowers or the like, occurring here and there in each: should cut up both into scraps, construct a patchwork out of each, and then say, How like these pieces are to each other.

(3) But the most important point of all is, that the words common are not 'unusual or startling,' or such as can fairly be called '*hapax legomena*.' I cannot but think that Archdeacon Farrar, not having looked into the matter for himself, jumbled up in his mind the two counts of Dr. Abbott's indictment, that 2 Peter employs unusual and startling words, and that he copied from Josephus. Dr. Abbott himself confesses with the utmost *naïveté* (p. 211) that in those parts of 2 Peter, where the unusual and startling words are found, there is not a trace of obligation to Josephus; in other words, that if we find in 2 Peter a word likely to have fastened itself on anyone's memory, it was not from Josephus he got it. And this is not at all surprising, for Josephus is a commonplace writer, in whom many startling and unusual words are not to be found. In the case of real borrowing between Peter and Jude, some of the words which are common are very striking ones.

Now, when we are examining whether one writer is under

literary obligation to another, everything turns on whether the phrases common are unusual, or such as two writers might independently employ. What first roused my distrust of Dr. Abbott's argument was the total want of discrimination with which he swells his list of proofs with instances which prove no more than that the writers compared both wrote in Greek. He asks us (p. 54) to accept as a proof that one writer copied from another that, in speaking of the rising of a heavenly body, both use the verb *ἀνατέλλω*; and (p. 57) in considering whether 2 Peter copied Josephus, he asks us to give weight to the fact that in speaking of the Divine power both employ the word *δύναμις*. This reminds us of the charge (see p. 351) that Luke was indebted to Josephus for his knowledge of the words *τύπτω* and *παῖς*. It is clear that if we are to arrive at any trustworthy conclusions we must begin by weeding out from Dr. Abbott's lists words too common to afford any proof of literary connexion.

But in deciding what words are to be so regarded, there is a question of principle to be settled. Dr. Abbott allows that if words common to Josephus and Peter are also found in the LXX. we cannot treat them as unusual words, being bound to acknowledge that if Peter borrowed them at all, he may have taken them from the LXX. and not from Josephus. Dr. Abbott then proceeds to argue: Since if one of these common words is found in the LXX., we cannot build an argument on it; therefore, if it be not found in the LXX., we can. And accordingly he classes such a common Greek word as *τοιόσδε* as an unusual word, because not found in the LXX. This argument might well be transferred to a book on Logic, as an illustration for a chapter on fallacies. In order to make the logic good, we must supply a suppressed premiss, which Dr. Abbott will scarcely venture to assert, viz. that the only two sources whence 2 Peter could have drawn his Greek were the LXX. and Josephus, so that whatever he did not get from the one must have been taken from the other. But every one of the New Testament writers was using Greek every day of his life; and it is absurd to suppose that the men of that day limited their vocabulary to that of the LXX., any more than in our daily conversation we limit ours to that of the English

Bible. There is none of the New Testament writers who does not more or less frequently step outside the Biblical limits, and enter into those of secular, and even classical Greek. But if the charge of Babooism brought against 2 Peter be well founded, he, of all others, might be expected to be least likely to confine himself to Biblical limits. For in the sense of our discussion a Baboo means one with an extensive literary and very little practical knowledge of a language. 2 Peter is supposed to have got up his Greek from solitary reading: he is censured for the number of words he uses, which are neither found in the O. T. nor in Josephus; so that Dr. Abbott is the last who ought to ask us to believe that it was to these two books he confined his studies.

But, indeed, I must give up the attempt to save Dr. Abbott's logic; for he does not himself pretend that 2 Peter's reading was limited to the books just named, part of his indictment being that our author was also indebted to Philo. Dr. Abbott, indeed, has worked this vein rather superficially; for there is a whole host of 2 Peter's rare words in Philo—ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, ἐπίλυσις, ἐμπορεύομαι, ὑπόδειγμα, ἄθεσμος, ἄλωσις and παρανομία in close neighbourhood (*De Mos.* I. 127); ἐντρυφᾶν, ζόφος, ὑπέρογκα, δελεάζειν, στοιχεῖα, ῥοῖζος, ἀμαθία, ἰσότιμος (*De Sac. Ab. et Cain*, p. 165; as in 2 Pet., 'equal in value,' not, as in Josephus, to whom Dr. Abbott refers the word, 'equal in privilege'); and, if anyone thinks it important to add it, τοιόσδε.

For my purpose it is immaterial to discuss whether the possession of a common vocabulary proves that 2 Peter copied Philo. There is no reason why the Apostle Peter might not have been indebted to Philo. Eusebius (ii. 17) repeats a story that had reached him, that, in the reign of Claudius, Peter and Philo had been at Rome at the same time, and had conversed with each other. Eusebius accepts the story as true, and believes that Philo then learned from Peter many things about Christianity. I do not myself believe that Peter visited Rome at so early a time; but Philo's embassy to Caligula is a historical fact. It is rational to believe that Philo, on his visit to Rome, had much intercourse with the Jewish colony in that city; and that his writings

would thenceforward, if not before, be well known to the Jews in Rome; and might, to a certain extent, influence their vocabulary. But when we find Philonic words in N. T. writers we are not bound to believe either that they took them directly from Philo, or even that Philo was the first to use these words. I have already protested against Dr. Abbott's tacit assumption that the 'linguistic sphere' of the contemporaries of 2 Peter is adequately represented by the meagre remains still extant in the LXX., even including the Apocryphal books. To complete that sphere we must include the works of Philo, which are a most valuable addition to our knowledge of the theological language of the Jews of the Apostolic age. But, though Philo may have enlarged that language, he did not create it. It follows that coincidences of a New Testament writer with Philo are not necessarily proofs of borrowing.

But I have no interest now in contesting that point; for I am surprised that Dr. Abbott had not acuteness to see that, in endeavouring to establish 2 Peter's obligation to Philo, he was doing his best to demolish his own case.* Josephus admired Philo, and notoriously copied him (*Dict. Chr. Biog.*, iii. 452). The preface to the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which Dr. Abbott supposes to have served as a model to 2 Peter, is itself derived from the opening of *De Opif. Mund.* of Philo. When we turn to the latter passage, among the first things to catch the eye is one of the phrases Peter is accused of borrowing from Josephus. The πλαστοῖς λόγοις of 2 Pet. ii. 3 is alleged to be derived from the πλασμάτων of Josephus; but, in the corresponding passage of Philo, we have μυθικοῖς πλάσμασιν, and within a few lines μύθους πλασάμενος. It is

* Dr. Abbott's idea is that the theory that 2 Peter had borrowed from Josephus would become more probable if it could be proved that this author was a habitual borrower, destitute of all originality. It is scarcely a paradox to say that, on the contrary, this author was so original, that he hardly knew how to borrow when he tried. If he were not Peter, it was his business to borrow from the First Epistle; but he scarcely makes an attempt. He knew the Old Testament history, yet he has extremely little of Old Testament language. He had read St. Paul's letters; but we should not have been able to prove it if he had not told us; and yet we can distinctly trace the use of Paul's writings in the First Epistle, though it does not mention Paul. And if he used Jude's Epistle, he exercises great freedom in departing from his original.

not clear to me that Peter's phrase was derived either from Josephus or Philo; but, in any case, if Josephus steals from Philo, how can he claim exclusive rights of proprietorship as against Peter? Why are we to suppose that Peter took from the stream, when he could as easily have drawn from the fountain head?

We are now in a position to deal with Dr. Abbott's list of coincidences. We first strike out coincidences in commonplace words; for the whole force of the argument from coincidences depends on the rarity of the words employed. Dr. Abbott begins by inducing his readers to grant that two writers, who both employ the phrase 'golden sleep,' probably do not so independently. On the strength of that concession, he assumes that, if two writers both happen to say 'I think it right,' one must have borrowed from the other. We next strike out of Dr. Abbott's lists words that occur elsewhere N. T., or LXX.; for even one such occurrence proves that the word lay in Peter's 'linguistic sphere,' and therefore that his use of it needs no explanation. Such words are ἔξοδος for decease (Luke ix. 31: not used in Josephus absolutely, but with the addition of τοῦ ζῆν); μεγαλειότης (Luke ix. 43: see also Acts xix. 27; Jer. xxxiii. (xl.) 9); ἐφ' ὅσον (according to Dr. Abbott, not elsewhere N. T., but actually in precisely the same way, Matt. ix. 15; not as in Josephus with the addition of χρόνον, but so three times by St. Paul); μῦθος (four times in the Pastoral Epistles; common in Philo); θεῖος (nine times in LXX.); μέλλω (in the μελλήσω of 2 Pet. i. 12 there is a difficulty, both of reading and interpretation; in the οὐ μέλλω of Josephus, a common Greek word is used in the most commonplace way). I think it needless to give references for εὐσέβεια, καταφρονέω, παρών, or δύναμις (!).

The combinations of words on which Dr. Abbott lays stress are also of the most commonplace character. One of the most remarkable is ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, to which there is a parallel in Josephus. But καλῶς ποιεῖν, with a participle, is common N. T. (Acts x. 33; Phil. iv. 14; 3 John 6); and προσέχω is also a common word; and that two common words should happen to be combined is a matter calling for no remark. So also μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες. Ἐξακολουθέω

occurs four times in the LXX., and seems to be a favourite with our author, who uses it three times ; and we have seen that it is a mistake to treat *μῦθος* as an uncommon word. In Josephus there are two various readings, and it is not certain that *ἐξακολουθέω* is his word at all. I count it needless to discuss *γινώσκειν ὅτι* or *δίκαιον ἡγεῖσθαι*. Nor need I notice alleged coincidences in which there is no resemblance. Thus, Dr. Abbott swells his list by pointing out that Josephus has the word *εὐάλωτοι* ; 2 Peter, in quite a different sense and context, *εἰς ἅλωσιν*. Another case, in which 2 Peter certainly took singular pains to disguise his theft, is that, in Dr. Abbott's opinion, he derived *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* (i. 4) from *μακρὰς κοινωνοὶ ταλαιπωρίας* in Josephus. But if 2 Peter was incapable of constructing such a clause for himself, he had a much nearer model in Philo's *λογικῆς κεκοινωνήκασι φύσεως* (*De Somn.* i. p. 647).

When Dr. Abbott's lists have been thus weeded of futilities, and I come to inquire what Archdeacon Farrar refers to as 'startling and unusual words,' or, as he calls them, '*hapax legomena*,' found in two authors, I can think but of two cases—that 2 Peter uses *ἀρετή* concerning the excellence of God ; and that he speaks of the divine 'nature' *θεία φύσις*. But we have *τὰς ἀρετάς* concerning God in the First Epistle (ii. 9) ; and if it had been Dr. Abbott's object to prove that it was thence 2 Peter derived the word, he would, no doubt, have laid stress on the fact that in both places it occurs in immediate connexion with the verb *καλέω*, used concerning God's call of His people. The word is similarly used O.T., Is. xlii. 8, 12, xliii. 21, on which latter passage that of 1 Peter is based ; and in the singular, Hab. iii. 3. But in Philo the word, both singular and plural, is repeatedly used of God. Thus : *περὶ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν αὐτοῦ* (*Quis Rer. Div. Hær.* p. 488) ; and in the same page, *τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς τὴν ἀκρότητα* : and *τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ* (*De Somn.* i. p. 635). The word, then, plainly lay within Peter's 'linguistic sphere,' and there is no pretence for saying that he needed to go to Josephus to learn it. And the same thing may be said about *θεία φύσις*, which is also a Philonic phrase : *ᾔδει γὰρ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ* (*De Mos.* II. p. 143 : see also *De Spec. Legg.* p. 343).

Thus, Dr. Abbott has completely failed to establish his theory: but I must add that it is a theory which it was never rational to try to establish. For what are the ways in which an author exhibits his use of another? (1) He may take his ideas from another, following out the same arguments, and using the same illustrations: (2) he may derive from his predecessor some word or combination of words, such as two writers would not be likely to employ independently: (3) he may resemble his predecessor generally in his phraseology; and such resemblance of vocabulary would, of course, not be confined to one particular passage of his author. But in this case, what we are asked to believe is, that 2 Peter prepared himself for his task by studying one page of Josephus, and then tried how many words out of that page he could manage to introduce when writing on quite different topics. Did ever forger proceed in such a way? If he did, he surely took for his model the author for whom he desired to pass, and not one his knowledge of whom it was his interest to conceal. I must, therefore, estimate Dr. Abbott's speculation at the same value as the ingenious proofs that have been given that the plays of Shakespeare were written by Lord Bacon, or the Epistles of Clement of Rome by Henry Stephens.*

It may seem that, however successful we are in refuting the charge that 2 Peter copied from Josephus, by showing that his obligations are more likely to have been to Philo, yet this very characteristic of the Second Epistle makes it impossible that it could have the same author as the First.

---

* I refer here to the *Proteus Peregrinus* of Mr. Cotterill, a writer after Dr. Abbott's own heart, who employs the same methods, but with greater audacity. He shows that, not only the Epistles of Clement, but the tract of Lucian *De Morte Peregrini*, the Epistle to Diognetus, large portions of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, and several other works supposed to be ancient, are all modern forgeries. When it is objected to him that the Epistles of Clement are found in the Alexandrian MS., in the MS. lately found at Constantinople, and in a Syriac translation, he owns that these facts do present a certain difficulty; but declares that if the difficulty were ten times as great, it would not be as great as the improbability that the coincidences he has pointed out could be accidental (p. 318). Reversing his argument, I draw from his book a confirmation of my view, that coincidences as close as any Dr. Abbott instances, and far more numerous, are found in cases where borrowing is demonstrably impossible.

I own that I felt some surprise on being taught by Dr. Gwynn that affinity with Philo is a point of likeness, not of unlikeness, between the two Petrine Epistles. I give some of his proofs. The references here and above are to the pages of Mangey's edition. (1) The word *ἀναγεννάω* seems to have been introduced into Christian theology by 1 Peter; it does not occur in any previous Greek author, but must have been known to Philo, who uses *ἀναγέννησις* (*De Mund. Incorrup.* p. 489; *De Mund.* p. 609). (2) Again, compare the vocabulary of the following two passages in 1 Peter: *τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου* (i. 7); *τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα* (ii. 2; *ἄδολος*, here only N. T.; *λογικός*, only Rom. xii. 1); with Philo (*Alleg.* i. 59, in immediate connexion with *τὸ λογικόν*) *ἡ φρόνησις ἣν εἵκασε χρυσίῳ ἀδόλῳ καὶ καθαρᾷ καὶ πεπυρωμένῃ καὶ δεδοκιμασμένῃ καὶ τιμίᾳ φύσει*. Closely following, in Philo, we find two other Petrine words, *ἄφθαρτος* and *ἀπονέμω* (p. 61), the latter here only N. T. (3) *οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ* (1 Pet. i. 18); *θησαυρὸν οὐκ ἐν ᾧ χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος οὐσίαι φθαρταὶ κατάκεινται* (*De Cherub.* i. p. 147). (4) *ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν* (ii. 25, here only in this application N. T.); but in Philo, *De Somn.* i. 634) we have [*Θεῷ*] *τῷ τῶν ὅλων ἐπισκόπῳ*: and it may be added that in the same place Philo calls God *τῶν ὅλων κτίστης*, this title being given to the Almighty by 1 Peter (iv. 19), who alone of N. T. writers uses the word. (5) An O. T. citation is made with the formula *περιέχει* only N. T., in 1 Pet. ii. 6; but also in Philo, *De Abr.* ii. p. 1. (6) *ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε* (ii. 9); here only N. T. The verb in the corresponding place in the LXX. Isaiah is *διηγοῦμαι*; but Philo (*De Plant. Noe*, p. 348) has *ὃς τὰς* [*τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργων*] *ὑπερβολὰς . . . ἐξαγγελεῖ*. (7) The rare word *ἀνάχυσις* (1 Pet. iv. 4) occurs *De Mundi Incorr.* p. 507, and elsewhere.

It is plain that, if there be evidence to prove that 2 Peter copied from Philo, there is abundance of like evidence available for the conviction of 1 Peter. I will not undertake to say whether in either case direct obligation can be proved; and possibly some things which we might suppose to be peculiar to Philo, had previously formed part of current theological language. But, at the time the First Epistle was

written, Philo is likely to have been, for a dozen years, the author most read by educated Jews at Rome; and, therefore, one who mixed in that circle, and engaged in its discussions, could hardly escape at least indirect influence from Philo. This may, perhaps, afford the simplest explanation of the Philonic colouring of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And Dr. Gwynn has noticed that even Paul's letters, written from Rome, present coincidences with Philo.*

I do not think it worth while to add some proofs with which Dr. Gwynn has furnished me, that the charge of copying from Josephus might be made with as much plausibility against the First Epistle as against the Second. But, certainly, the result of an examination of Dr. Abbott's argument has been to emphasize many points of latent resemblance between the two Epistles. If the Second Epistle copies from Jude, so does the First from St. Paul and St. James. Both letters have a good deal in common with the diction of the Græco-Jewish literature represented for us by Philo and Josephus. They have peculiarities of language in common, including some objected to by Dr. Abbott as if only found in 2 Peter.† And, as Dr. Lumby has well shown, it is characteristic of both to use striking and even startling expressions, and to introduce unusual and mysterious topics. On the whole, Dr. Abbott's Paper only serves to show how an able

*(1.) *Philipp.* iii. 12: οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη . . . τετελείωμαι, διώκω δὲ . . . εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον.

= Philo, *Alleg.* iii. p. 101: ὅταν τελειωθῇς καὶ βραβείων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξιωθῇς (both of *death*).

(2.) *ib.* iii. 20: ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει.

= Philo, *De Conf. Lingg.* p. 416: [the souls of the wise] ἐπανέρχονται ἐκεῖσε πάλιν ὅθεν ὡρμήθησαν, πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξένον δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν ᾧ παρῴκησαν, νομίζουσαι.

Also *De Joseph*, p. 51: ἐφιέμενος ἐγγραφεῖσθαι ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ καὶ ἀρίστῳ πολιτεύματι τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου.

(3.) *Coloss.* i. 15: ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.

= Philo, *De Mundi Opif.*, p. 6: τὸν δὲ ἀόρατον καὶ νοητὸν θεῖον λόγον εἰκόνα λέγει Θεοῦ.

To which add *De Somn.* i. p. 653: . . . ὁ κόσμος ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος. Cf. Heb. i. 6, ii. 17.

† Bunsen (*Christianity and Mankind*, v. 36), in a vain attempt to discredit 1 Peter, argues from the close resemblance which he finds between it and 2 Peter, and which he tries to establish by enumerating several thoughts and expressions common to both.

and accomplished scholar may go astray, when, on the strength of a comparative study of one New Testament book, and a few pages of one secular author, he attempts to draw conclusions which could not be safely maintained unless they had been founded on a thorough investigation of a much wider subject—the relations of New Testament Greek to the written and spoken Greek of the Apostolic age.*

---

* Quite lately Mommsen has published (*Hermes*, xxi. 142) from a MS. in the Phillips Library at Cheltenham a previously unknown stichometrical catalogue of the books of the Bible, and also of the writings of Cyprian. The list had been made in Africa in the year 359. It gives the Gospels in the order: Matthew, Mark, John, Luke. Then follow, in a singular order, the Epistles of Paul, among which that to the Hebrews is not counted, the Acts, the Apocalypse, and, lastly, the Catholic Epistles, as follows:—

epl̄ae Iohannis III. ūr CCCCL.
una sola.
epl̄ae Petri II. v̄er CCC.
una sola.

Zahn considers the 'una sola' as a protest made by one who held to an older tradition, which in each case acknowledged only one Epistle. But I am disposed to agree with Harnack, that we ought to supply Judae in the first case, and Jacobi in the second; since the Epistles of Jude and James come in the respective places in the Claromontane list.

XXVI.

NON-CANONICAL BOOKS.

HAVING in Lectures XI. and XIX. spoken of Apocryphal Gospels and Apocryphal Acts, I now add a lecture on other books known to the early Church, but which did not find admission into the Canon.

The Apocalypse of Peter.—I give the first place to this work, because it claimed Apostolic authority, and because we infer from the Muratorian Fragment (see pp. 50, 225), that it had obtained a place, though not an undisputed place, in Church reading before the end of the second century. With regard to its contents we have only positive information as to two passages, both indicating that the book contained a description of the Last Judgment. One of these is preserved by Clement of Alexandria in the *Prophetic Selections* (41, 48), which, according to the general opinion of scholars, formed part of his *Hypotyposeis*. Clement, who is habitually indiscriminate in his reception of books, cites this Apocalypse as a genuine Petrine work* and as Scripture ; but the extract which he preserves gives us no favourable opinion of it. It deals with the future condition of abortive births, and of children born in adultery, exposed by their parents. The

* Lipsius, in his article APOCALYPSES, in Smith's *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, states as on the authority of Eusebius (*H.E.* vi. 14), that Clement reckoned this Apocalypse among the 'antilegomena.' But it was Eusebius, not Clement who so reckoned it. What the passage referred to says is, that 'Clement in his *Hypotyposeis* gave short comments (διηγήσεις) on all the Canonical Scripture, not even omitting the disputed books, viz. Jude and the other Catholic Epistles and the Epistle of Barnabas, and what is called the Apocalypse of Peter.' With respect to Jude, see p. 493. Clement repeatedly quotes the Epistle of Barnabas, and appears to have no doubt of its Apostolic origin; and there is no reason to suppose that he thought less favourably of the Apocalypse of Peter.

former, it says, will be handed over to an angel nurse (ἀγγέλῳ τημελούχῳ), under whom they will receive instruction, and after suffering what they would have suffered if they had lived in the body, will attain the better abode. The exposed children receive like nursing and instruction, and grow to the condition of the faithful here of the age of a hundred. On account of the injustice done them they obtain mercy and salvation, but only so far as freedom from punishment. I should infer that the writer must have held the general necessity of baptism in order to salvation, a special exception being made in favour of these murdered infants, who, it may be remarked, were presumably the children of heathens. The passage goes on to tell that the bright shining of these children shall strike like lightning the eyes of their unnatural mothers, from whose unused milk shall be generated carnivorous little beasts which shall devour them. I have quoted these puerilities at length, because the passage furnishes proof that the Apocalypse of Peter retained high consideration so late as the beginning of the fourth century. Methodius (see p. 393) says: 'We have received in the divinely-inspired Scriptures, that even those who are begotten in adultery are handed over to angel nurses (τημελούχοις ἀγγέλοις). For if they came into being in opposition to the will and decree of the blessed nature of God,* how should they be delivered over to angels to be nourished with much gentleness and indulgence? and how could they boldly cite their own parents, before the judgment-seat of Christ, to accuse them, saying:—"Thou didst not, O Lord, grudge us thy common light, but these exposed us for death, despising thy command"?' (*Sympos.* ii. 6). There can be no doubt that what Methodius here cites as 'divinely-inspired Scripture' is taken from the passage of Peter's Apocalypse that is quoted by Clement of Alexandria.

The other extant passage of this Apocalypse is preserved by Macarius Magnes (see p. 163). We can infer that at the very end of the fourth century it had not quite lost its consideration. The heathen objector, as if the book were

* The reader will note the Θεοῦ φύσις (see p. 555).

recognized by Christians as an authority, selects a saying of it for attack—'The earth shall present all to God in the Day of Judgment, and itself shall then be judged with the heaven that surrounds it.' Macarius,* in reply, remarks that it will not avail him to decline the authority of that Apocalypse, the same doctrine being taught in Is. xxxiv. 4, and Matt. xxiv. 35.

I quoted (p. 476) the formal judgment of Eusebius (iii. 25) about this book. He places it with the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas in the second rank of disputed books (which he calls *νόθα*), or books not canonical, but known to most ecclesiastical writers, and which stand on a different level from books of heretical origin (among which he names the Gospel of Peter), which no ecclesiastical writer has deemed it fit to make use of. In an earlier passage (iii. 3) Eusebius has with less discrimination lumped together all the Apocryphal books ascribed to Peter (the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Peter, the Preaching of Peter, and the Revelation of Peter), as not received among Catholics, no ecclesiastical writer either of former days or his own having used testimonies from them. We have seen that the last sentence is too strongly worded, as far as the Apocalypse of Peter is concerned; but there can be no doubt that Eusebius is, in the main, right as to the weakness of external attestation for the book. And that it had generally dropped out of Church reading in his time may be inferred from his classing it not with the minor Catholic Epistles, but with the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. But a hundred years after the death of Eusebius its use was not absolutely extinct; for Sozomen, in speaking (vii. 19) of singular local usages in different Churches, tells that in his time this Apocalypse, though regarded as spurious by the ancients, was still annually read on Good Friday in some Churches of Palestine. Its continuance for some time in Church use is also testified

* Many critics think that Macarius has preserved portions of a lost heathen work directed against Christianity: I now incline to the opinion that Macarius has exercised his rhetorical skill in writing the objections as well as the answers, though no doubt the objections were such as he had really encountered in controversy.

by its being included in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (see p. 178), where it immediately follows the Revelation of St. John, and in the list of the *Codex Claromontanus* (see p. 473). Both these authorities agree in making the length of the book something less than a quarter of that of the Apocalypse of St. John, the number of στίχοι being in the former list 1400 and 300, respectively; in the latter 1200 and 270. It has even been conjectured that this had originally formed part of the Sinaitic MS., of which six leaves have been lost, coming between the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. These leaves, no doubt, contained one of the disputed books; and the Revelation of Peter is not too long to have been included in them. But it is doubtful whether it was long enough to fill the gap, and Mr. Rendel Harris (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, 1884, p. 54) has urged the preferable claims of the Psalms of Solomon,* which originally followed the Canonical books in the Alexandrian MS. Each page of the Sinaitic ordinarily contains four columns; but the poetical books of the Old Testament are written in στίχοι, or verses divided according to the sense, and with only two columns on a page. Now, the Epistle of Barnabas ends on the third column of a page, and the fourth is left blank, contrary to the scribe's usual practice. This would be explained, if the book which was immediately to follow was poetical, requiring two columns on a page. Thus, the book of Malachi ends on the third column of a page, and the fourth is left blank, because the following book (the Psalms) is written στιχηδόν.

It is barely worth while to mention conjectural attempts to discover traces of the influence of Peter's Apocalypse.

* As it does not fall within my plan to treat of Old Testament Apocrypha, I content myself with mentioning that these Psalms are eighteen in number, and were probably written about 50 years before Christ. The list of the contents of *Codex* A shows that they formed part of that MS., following the Epistles of Clement; but these pages are now lost. These Psalms were edited from another MS. by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudep. V. T.*, and more recently by Hilgenfeld in his *Messias Judæorum*. In addition to the proof which the presence of these Psalms in *Codex* A affords that they obtained some amount of circulation among Christians, it may be mentioned that they are included in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, and that they are made use of in the Gnostic work, *Pistis Sophia*. That work contains several Psalms, some of which are adaptations of Psalms of David; others, of these Psalms of Solomon.

The extant fragments of the treatise on the universe, by Hippolytus, contain a description of the unseen world and the intermediate state, which Bunsen imagined to have been derived from this source. With less probability, Hilgenfeld claims for this Apocalypse a passage twice quoted by Hippolytus (*De Antichrist.*, 15, 54) as a saying of a prophet, but not found in our text of the Old Testament. It is not likely that Peter would have been cited as 'the prophet;' and, not to quote other instances, we have seen (p. 478) that early Fathers sometimes read in their Old Testament text passages not found in ours. From the assumption, however, that 'the prophet' means the 'Apocalypse of Peter,' Hilgenfeld draws a startling inference. He finds further on (c. 68) in the same treatise of Hippolytus: 'The prophet says "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light;"' and he concludes that the original of this saying is also to be traced to Peter's Apocalypse, whence it was borrowed by the author of the 'spurious' Epistle to the Ephesians! Hilgenfeld's discussion is to be found in the last fasciculus of his *Nov. Test. ext. Can. recept.*, 2nd edition, 1884.

I will not speak at length of other Apocalypses, none of which can be called really early. The most important is that of Paul, whose account, 2 Cor. xii. 2–4, of the revelations with which he had been favoured offered a temptation to a forger to atone for the Apostle's silence on the subject. Accordingly we hear from Epiphanius (xxxviii. 2) that the Gnostics had an *ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου*, which professed to be a secret record of the mysteries then revealed to the Apostle. All trace of this book has been lost. That which has actually come down to us as the 'Apocalypse of Paul' is much later. Sozomen, in a passage (vii. 19) already cited, tells that a work thus inscribed was in much esteem among the monks, and he reports that the book was said to have been found by divine revelation in the reign of the then present emperor (Theodosius the younger) buried in a marble box, under what had been the house of Paul at Tarsus. Sozomen ascertained from an aged presbyter at Tarsus that this story was not true. The same Apocalypse is condemned by Augustine (*in Johan.*

Evang. c. 16, tract. 98). It is to be found in Tischendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphæ* (1863), and more recently has been the subject of an investigation by Brandes, *Visio Pauli*, 1885. I content myself with mentioning that the appearance in the book of an angel Temeluchus indicates that the author had studied the Apocalypse of Peter.

The Epistle of Barnabas.—A second work included by Eusebius in his list of disputed books bears the name of a member of the Apostolic company, the Epistle of Barnabas. It is found in the Sinaitic MS., beginning on the leaf where the Revelation ends, and placed, together with the Shepherd of Hermas, as a kind of appendix to the new Testament books. Its being found at all in a MS. intended for Church use seems to indicate that it had at one time been used in the public reading of the Church, while its position at the end shows that at the time the MS. was written it stood on a lower level than the Canonical writings. The same thing may be inferred from its inclusion among the 'antilegomena' in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, where it follows the 'Revelation of Peter.' It is quoted several times by Clement of Alexandria,* who calls its author sometimes the Apostle Barnabas, sometimes the Prophet Barnabas. Elsewhere he states that he was one of the Seventy; and one passage is worth quoting as throwing light on the authority which Clement ascribed to the Epistle. It is taken by Eusebius (ii. 1) from the seventh book of the *Hypotyposeis*:—'Our Lord after his Resurrection communicated the Gnosis to James the Just, John, and Peter: these communicated it to

* Lightfoot says (*Clement*, p. 12), 'Clement of Alexandria cites the "Apostle Clement" as he cites the "Apostle Barnabas," one of whose interpretations he nevertheless criticises and condemns with a freedom which he would not have allowed himself in dealing with writings regarded by him as canonical.' I do not think that the passage referred to (*Strom.* ii. 15) quite warrants the inference drawn from it; and the phrase 'criticises and condemns' is certainly too strong. Clement is engaged in showing that all sins are not equal, and he quotes, apparently with approbation, an exposition by Barnabas of the three classes of sinners referred to in Ps. i. 1. It is scarcely a 'condemnation' of Barnabas that he goes on to mention alternative, or even preferable, ways of making out the three classes. It is more to the purpose that Clement (*Paed.* ii. 10) corrects the natural history of Barnabas, but without mention of him by name.

the other Apostles, and the other Apostles to the Seventy, of whom Barnabas also was one.' Accordingly, Clement would regard the 'Gnosis,' of which the Epistle under consideration is full, as really a divine tradition, though only reported second-hand. Origen also appeals to the 'Catholic Epistle of Barnabas' (*Adv. Cels.* i. 63), and cites it as Scripture (*Comm. in Rom.* i. 24). These two Alexandrian witnesses make up nearly the whole of the testimony favourable to the Epistle. If it were not for the existence of an early Latin translation, we might even doubt whether it was known at all in the West before the fourth century. One coincidence with Justin and Irenæus has been mentioned (p. 535); but in another place that admits of comparison, an allegorical interpretation of the law concerning clean and unclean animals, Irenæus (v. 8) seems to be quite independent of Barnabas (10). Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 7) appears to be clearly indebted to Barnabas (7) in describing the scapegoat as pierced and spit upon; yet, if he knew our Epistle as that of Barnabas, it seems strange that he should ascribe the same authorship to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Jerome (*De Viris Illust.* 6: see also *Comm. in Ezek.* xliii. 16) makes no doubt that the author of the Epistle was the Barnabas of the New Testament, but says that the Epistle is counted among apocryphal Scriptures. Elsewhere (*Dial. cont. Pelag.* iii. 2) he quotes from the Epistle a saying which had been previously quoted by Origen (*Adv. Cels.* i. 63); but he attributes it to Ignatius, probably through lapse of memory.

Turning to the internal evidence, we find the contents of the book such as certainly would not make us wish to include it in our Canon of Scripture. To cite one oft-quoted passage, Barnabas misquotes the book of Genesis (see Gen. xiv. 14; xvii. 27), as recording that Abraham circumcised 318 of his household, a number expressed in Greek by the letters τιή. It does not appear whether Barnabas called to mind that the book had been written not in Greek but in Hebrew. At all events he expounds that ιή denote Jesus, and τ' the cross; and he is so satisfied with his exposition that he adds, 'No one has received a more genuine word from me than

this; but I know that ye are worthy.'* He goes on to explain the meaning of the prohibitions against eating the flesh of the animals counted as unclean, of all of which he gives spiritual explanations, in which the natural history is quite as curious as the theology. These spiritual explanations constitute the 'Gnosis' which, in the mind of this author, gives him his chief claim on his readers' attention. One example will suffice. The prohibition to eat the hyena means that we are to avoid adultery and other such sins; for this beast changes its sex each year, being one year male, the next female. I remember that when I was a young student myself I heard some of these passages quoted in a sermon in our chapel by one whose memory we still hold in honour. The preacher's view was that the Epistle was a genuine work of the Apostle Barnabas, and he produced the passages in order to show what rubbish an Apostle was capable of writing when he was not inspired. He thought thereby to exalt the authority of the inspired Scriptures as being *sui generis*, and unlike not only the writings of other men, but the writings of the same men when not inspired. His object was to establish the supreme authority of Scripture, but in real truth he did just the reverse. For according to this view the authority of Scripture must yield to whatever authority it is that settles which of the Apostolic writings are inspired, and which not. I own I know no proof that the Apostles were inspired in a different way when they were writing and when they were speaking; and in a different way when they were writing some books and when

* Many of the Fathers have thought this exposition worth copying, *e. g.* Clem. Alex., *Strom.* vi. 11, p. 782; Ambrose, *De Abraha*, i. 15; Prudentius, *Psychom.* 57; and even in our own times it has found a defender. Keble (*Tracts for the Times*, 89) says: 'In whatever measure the fact is made out, that the received Greek version of the Scriptures was under a peculiar providence, in the same degree it is rendered not improbable, that even in such an apparently casual thing as the number of Abraham's servants there was an eye to the benefit and consolation which the Church should long after receive, on recognizing, as it were, her Saviour's cypher, in the account of the one holy family triumphantly wrestling against the powers of the world.' The Valentinians, whether deriving their method from Barnabas, or discovering it independently, found their 18 Aeons in the first two letters of the Saviour's name (Irenæus i. iii. 2).

they were writing others. And, as I have said, if this view be correct, the supreme authority in the Church is that which brings Apostles to its bar, tests their writings, and assigns to some the attribute of inspiration which it denies to others. But what that authority is I don't know. I know that the general sense of the Christian Church has refused to put the Epistle of Barnabas on a level with those of St. Paul; but if you ask by what tribunal, or by what formal act this conclusion has been arrived at, I should be as much puzzled as if you asked me by what tribunal it has been decided that Shakespeare is a greater poet than Beaumont and Fletcher. Without saying anything about the Church's claim to expect Divine guidance, we can hardly refuse to yield at least as much deference to her decisions as we pay to received opinion in matters of taste. And so, no matter who wrote the Epistle we are considering, we shall not accept it as inspired. But if we believe the Apostle Barnabas to have been the author, since he was a man who in his lifetime had claims, like those of St. Paul, to be God's inspired messenger, we require a theory to explain the grounds on which we are to maintain that the writings of one are more above our criticism than those of the other.*

It is perhaps not preparing you to judge with quite unbiassed minds of the question of the authorship of the Epistle that I have allowed you to see what consequences are likely to follow if the Apostolic authority be conceded. But judges who are above being prejudiced by considerations of this sort, and who would have no difficulty in believing Apostles to have been guilty of any amount of error, have pretty unanimously decided that the Epistle was written at a later time than Barnabas is likely to have lived to, and that the author is a different manner of man from what the historical Barnabas is described as having been. The main argument is derived from the whole attitude of the writer towards Judaism. The historical Barnabas was a Levite, and was trusted by the Jerusalem Church, to whom he introduced Paul. In

* Westcott, for example, holds (*N. T. Canon*, p. 42) that Barnabas can in no case be ranked with the Twelve, or St. Paul, not having received his Apostolate directly from our Lord, as they did.

his only difference with St. Paul on the subject of Judaism he erred by too great concessions to the Jewish party. Now the writer of the Epistle does not show that acquaintance with Jewish rites which the Levite Barnabas must have had. I exemplified to you, in the case of the number 318, that he does not quote the Old Testament accurately. In fact gross inaccuracy is the rule with him; and in his account of Jewish rites (and on the symbolizing of Christ by these rites he builds many arguments) he deviates widely from the Old Testament. Nor can we have recourse to the supposition that the rites traditionally practised in Jerusalem at that time differed from those prescribed in the Old Testament; for the Talmud, which may be supposed to have preserved Jewish traditions, gives the so-called Barnabas as little countenance as the Old Testament does.

But more remarkable even than his inaccuracy in speaking of Jewish institutions is his total want of respect for them. He does not look on the performance of the Jewish rites as introductory and preparatory for Christ, but as a gross sin—a misconception of the true meaning of the law. He has a spiritual exposition for the Mosaic precepts, and he holds that the Jews, by taking them literally, excluded themselves from God's covenant. He even represents the Jews as deceived by an evil angel. Paul forbade the Gentiles to be circumcised; but, in Acts xxi., the statement is repelled as a calumny that he taught the Jews to forsake Moses, and not to circumcise their children nor walk after the customs. This writer, under the name of Barnabas, would seem to condemn the Jews for having observed such customs even before our Lord's coming. And his whole tone of feeling towards the Jewish nation is such, that when I balance the probabilities that a born Gentile should acquire as much knowledge of the Old Testament as this writer displays, or that a born Jew should come to feel towards his own nation so completely as an outsider, I prefer to embrace the former probability.*

* It is worth while, in this point of view, to compare this Epistle with the Gospel according to St. John, which has been characterized by some critics as 'anti-Jewish' (see pp. 23, 277), but which will be seen to be intensely Jewish as compared with Barnabas.

A less formidable difficulty in the way of ascribing the authorship to the Apostle Barnabas arises from the date of the Epistle. There is a range of some forty or fifty years within which the date may lie; but it is certain (*ch.* 16) that it is later than the destruction of Jerusalem. Now (see p. 466) we should not expect to find the Apostle Barnabas in activity so late; and the silence of Paul's later Epistles about him might lead us to think he had died before Paul. But this is only a presumption which must yield to any good evidence on the other side; and Paul's silence would be accounted for if Barnabas had gone off to work in a completely different sphere—for example, Egypt. A limit in the other direction to the date of the Epistle is furnished by its complete silence as to any of the Gnostic theories which caused so much controversy in the Church quite early in the second century. The anti-Judaism of the Epistle might make us think of Marcion; but the Epistle is distinctly pre-Marcionite, there being not the least trace of any of the notions peculiar to that heretic.* On these grounds the Epistle cannot be dated later than A. D. 120. There are two passages which have been used to determine more precisely the date of the Epistle. In *ch.* 4, in proof that the last days are at hand, he quotes Daniel's prophecies (vii. 8, 24) of ten kings, and of one king overthrowing three others. He does not enter into the question how the ten kings were to be made out, but merely remarks, 'ye ought therefore to understand.' The brevity of this comment indicates that Barnabas found the fulfilment of the prophecy in some patent fact, and not in one requiring historical or chronological studies to discover it. I therefore know no explanation of his words so natural as that the Epistle was written in the reign of Vespasian. It is true that a historical student might discover that, counting Julius Cæsar, Vespasian was only the tenth emperor, while Daniel's words

* With regard to the suggestion, thrown out p. 457, that this may be the Epistle to the Alexandrians rejected, on account of its Marcionite tendencies, in the Muratorian Fragment, it must be borne in mind that even if our Epistle was really addressed to the Alexandrians, there is no evidence that it ever bore that title; and that it is even doubtful whether it was known in the West at the date of that Fragment.

would lead us to think of his 'little horn' as representing an eleventh king; but Barnabas is one of the last writers from whom minute accuracy of interpretation need be expected. If he lived in the reign of Vespasian, the rapid overthrow in succession of three emperors, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, might naturally make him think that he was witnessing a fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy of one king subduing three. I know no other time when his language would be natural. On this account, though some other considerations would induce me to push down the date of the Epistle to the second century, I find it hard to resist the inference that we must ascribe it to the reign of Vespasian, A. D. 70–79. In the other passage (16) he quotes the prophecy 'They that destroyed this temple shall themselves build it up again,'* and adds, 'and so it comes to pass. Through their making war it was destroyed by their enemies; and now both they and the servants of their enemies shall build it up again.' It has been supposed that this refers to some attempts to rebuild the Temple in the reign of Hadrian; but I find no evidence of anything of the kind to give a probable explanation of the language of Barnabas; and it seems to me plain from the rest of the chapter that it is in the building up of a spiritual temple that he finds the fulfilment of the prophecy. The argument, therefore, for the earlier date, drawn from the former passage, remains undisturbed.

There is nothing in the letter itself to determine the place to which it was addressed; but since it is from Alexandria we first hear of it, it seems probable enough that it was sent to that city. Alexandria contained a large Jewish population, and thus the conflict with Judaism would there occupy much of Christian attention. Possibly, too, some Jewish rites may have been different in Egypt and in Palestine. The name Barnabas, found in the title of the letter, does not appear in the letter itself. All that we discover from it is that it was written by a Christian teacher to a Church in which he had himself laboured, and to which he was accordingly well

* A free quotation from Isaiah xlix. 17 (LXX.): *ταχὺ οἰκοδομηθήσῃ ὑφ' ὧν καθῃρέθης, καὶ οἱ ἐρημώσαντές σε ἐξελεύσονται ἐκ σοῦ.*

known. We are not forced to suppose that it was written from a distance: the author may have merely wished to leave his people a written record of his teaching. If the author was not the Apostle Barnabas—and I find it hard to believe he was—the question will be asked how the letter came to bear his name. The best conjecture I can make, setting aside the guess that the author's name may really have been Barnabas, is that the Church of Alexandria was founded, if not by Barnabas himself, by men of Cyprus, who owed their knowledge of the Gospel to him, and that so his name came to be attached to a venerable record of early teaching preserved in that Church.

The Epistle of Clement.—This venerable document has clearly a right to be next considered. It is true that although Eusebius calls the Epistle *μεγάλη, θαυμασία, ἀνωμολογημένη παρὰ πᾶσιν* (iii. 16, 37), he does not include it in his list of ecclesiastical books (see p. 475); and even if the omission arose from inadvertence, the possibility that the book could be forgotten shows that it had no serious pretensions to canonical authority when Eusebius wrote. But it had evidently made a profound impression on the earlier Church. It was written in the name of the Church of Rome* to the Church of Corinth, and

* Not in the name of Clement, which is not once mentioned, and which we only learn to connect with the Epistle by independent tradition. In fact, it is remarkable how all through the first two centuries the importance of the bishop of Rome is merged in the importance of his Church. In the subsequent correspondence mentioned above, Dionysius of Corinth writes to the Church of Rome, not to Soter, its bishop. Ignatius, when on his way to suffer at the wild beast shows at Rome, writes to deprecate intercession likely to be there made for his release; and he addresses the Church, not the bishop. And it is curious, that from this writer, who is accounted the strongest witness for Episcopacy in early times, we could not discover that there was any bishop at Rome. No mention is made of the bishop of Rome in the Shepherd of Hermas. And in the account which Epiphanius, evidently drawing from an older writer, gives of the intercourse of Marcion with the Church of Rome (*Haer.* 42), the dealings of Marcion are represented as being entirely with the Roman presbyters; and it may be doubted whether Epiphanius found in his authority the solution which he suggests, that at the time the see was vacant. At the very end of the century, when Victor attempted to enforce uniformity of Easter observance, it was still in the name of his Church that he wrote, asking that provincial councils should be assembled in order to report on the matter. This is evidenced by the plural *ἠξιώσατε* in the reply of Polycrates (Euseb. v. 24).

was intended to appease a sedition in the latter Church, ending in the unwarrantable deposition of some presbyters from their office. The letter, which is framed on the model of the Apostolic Epistles, is mainly taken up with enforcing the duties of meekness, humility, and submission to lawful authority. The reception it met with in the Church to which it was addressed is evidenced by a letter written about A.D. 170, by Dionysius, then bishop of Corinth, to Soter, bishop of Rome, to acknowledge a gift of money which the Roman Church had sent, exercising their 'hereditary custom' of liberality. Dionysius states that the letter accompanying this gift had been read at their meeting on the Lord's Day, and would continue to be so read for their edification, as also the former letter of the Roman Church, written by Clement (Euseb. iv. 23). The public reading of Clement's letter spread to other Churches; and Eusebius (iii. 16) says that he knew of the practice existing in very many Churches, both formerly and in his own time (see also Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* 15, Photius, *Cod.* 113). With this agrees the fact that it is found (together with a second Epistle) in the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament, but coming as a kind of appendix after the Apocalypse. The scribe, however, has included it among New Testament books in his table of contents; and in a Syriac version, to be mentioned presently, it is even joined to the Catholic Epistles. On the other hand, in the list of Nicephorus it is not even placed with the 'antilegomena' in company with the Apocalypse of Peter and the Epistle of Barnabas, but among the 'Apocrypha,' with the Acts of Peter, John, and Thomas. It seems to have been scarcely known to the Western Church, and there is no evidence of any early translation into Latin. The second-century attestation to the Epistle is copious. It is clearly referred to by Hermas in a passage which will come under consideration in the next section; it is recognized by Hegesippus (Euseb. iii. 16, iv. 22), who speaks of it in connexion with his visit to Corinth, and probably found it in use there; it is cited by Irenæus (iii. 3), and several times by Clement of Alexandria, who once (*Strom.* iv. 17, p. 609) gives Clement the title of Apostle, and another time (vi. 8, p. 272) cites by mistake a passage of

Clement as from the prophet Barnabas. Probably Clement found the two Epistles of Clement and Barnabas together, appended to his 'Apostolus,' or collection of Apostolic letters. But the impression made by Clement's revival of the Apostolic method of teaching distant Churches is testified even more strongly by the indirect evidence of the use made of his letter. It is a matter of dispute whether certain coincidences in the Epistles of Ignatius are sufficient to prove acquaintance with Clement's letter, but there can be no doubt as to the constant employment of it in the Epistle of Polycarp. The beginning and ending of the letter of the Church of Smyrna, relating the martyrdom of Polycarp, are both fashioned after the pattern of Clement's Epistle; and his form of address, 'the Church *sojourning* in Rome (παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην) to the Church sojourning in Corinth,' became an established formula, which was adopted in the letters of Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb. iv. 23), and of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (v. 1). And further evidence is furnished by the legendary stories, having Clement for a leading personage, which gained so much circulation by the end of the second century or the beginning of the third. There can be no doubt that it was the celebrity which his widely-circulated Epistle had given to the name of Clement which recommended that name to the inventors of these legends.

The letter begins by explaining that it would have been written earlier if it had not been for repeated calamities in which the Church of Rome had been involved. It used to be supposed that the persecution under Nero was here referred to, but the best critics are now agreed that all the notes of time in the letter oblige us rather to refer it to the reign of Domitian,* during which the Roman Church had to suffer a severe trial of persecution. The date would thus be about A.D. 96. This date well agrees with the statement of Irenæus

* This date has the authority of Eusebius (iii. 16), and apparently also the earlier authority of Hegesippus. What Eusebius says is, that in the twelfth year of Domitian Clement succeeded to the bishopric of Rome; that he was the author of an admirable Epistle still extant, written in the name of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, to appease a sedition in the latter Church; and that Hegesippus testifies that the sedition took place in the time of the afore-mentioned.

(iii. 3), probably derived by him from Hegesippus, that the Apostles Peter and Paul, having founded the Church of Rome, committed the government of it to the Linus who is mentioned in the Epistle to Timothy; that to Linus succeeded Anencletus, and to Anencletus Clement. Thus Clement is separated by two Episcopates from the time of the Apostles. This corresponds very well with the interval between the reigns of Nero and Domitian, but cannot be reconciled with the fiction which made Peter first bishop of Rome, and Clement his immediate successor. When this fiction came to be accepted as historical truth, it was attempted to mend the chronology by a theory that Linus only held office as Peter's deputy, and dying during that Apostle's lifetime, was succeeded by Clement; Anencletus, who has left no mark on history, being degraded to the third place. But there is every reason for adhering to the account of our oldest witness, Irenæus. The names Linus, Cletus, Clement, have from the earliest times been commemorated in that order in the Roman Liturgy. What inducement could there have been for thrusting the unknown name of Cletus before that of Clement, unless it had a chronological title to precedence? If we have found reason to think that Clement belongs to the reign of Domitian, we cannot attach much value to a guess of Origen's (*In Johann.* i. 29), that he was the same as the Clement mentioned by Paul (Phil. iv. 3). The name is far too common a one to allow of our disregarding the difficulties of place and time which stand in the way of an identification.

In modern times it has been imagined that Episcopacy had not arisen before the end of the first century, and that Linus, Cletus, Clement, were but the names of leading presbyters. But if so, we may ask, how came it that the letter of the Roman Church should be universally known as the letter of Clement, whose name is not once mentioned in it? I know no good explanation of this but the old one, that this was because Clement was generally known to be at the head of the Roman Church at the time the letter was written. We need not suppose, however, that the name bishop was then distinctively used to denote the head of the Church, nor are we bound to think that the line of separation between him

and other presbyters was as marked as it became in later times. The words 'bishop' and 'presbyter' are used interchangeably by Clement, as in Paul's Pastoral Epistles. It has been thought, however, that although Clement's letter exhibits the prominence of a single person as chief in the Church of Rome, it affords evidence that there was no such prominence in the Church of Corinth, whose bishop is not mentioned in the Epistle. But this inference is not warranted; for it is plain from the letter itself that if Corinth had ever had a bishop, he was out of office at the time the letter was written. The letter was occasioned by the deposition of certain 'presbyters;' and it has been just said that Clement would use the name 'presbyter' in speaking of what we now call the 'bishop.' Now, it is to be observed that the state of things at Corinth is not adequately described by such phrases as 'schism,' 'feuds,' 'dissensions.' Clement calls it (*ch.* 1) an 'abominable and impious sedition' (μιαρᾶς καὶ ἀνοσίου στάσεως), which he compares (*ch.* 4) to the sedition which Dathan and Abiram made against Moses.* Accordingly he does not attempt to heal the Corinthian schism by exhortations to mutual concessions; but he rebukes those whom he addresses, and exhorts them to unequivocal submission to the authority which they had resisted. He tells them of the necessity of order in things temporal and in things spiritual; he tells them that those whom they had deposed held an office instituted by, and handed down from, the Apostles themselves. And he says: 'It is shameful, dearly beloved; yes, utterly shameful and unworthy of your conduct in Christ that it should be reported that the very steadfast and ancient Church of Corinth, for the sake of one or two persons, maketh sedition against its presbyters.' 'Ye, therefore, that laid the foundation of the sedition submit yourselves unto the presbyters, and receive chastisement unto repentance, bending the knees† of your heart.' The letter throws no light on the question

* I make a suggestion in the next section as to the possible origin of the sedition.

† The phrase is taken from the Prayer of Manasses, and seems to afford the earliest instance of its use. This document, which is included among the Apocryphal books of the Authorized Version, was not admitted into

whether the presbyters deposed were all equal in rank, or whether one was superior to the rest.

It bears on the question of Roman supremacy that we should understand the amount of disorder in Corinth. If there had been merely a schism there, we might wonder that Rome should undertake to arbitrate between rival claimants to office in a distant city. But if it be understood that the Corinthian Church had distinctly violated what was elsewhere recognized as Apostolic order, the letter ceases to give evidence of Roman supremacy, for the enormity of the offence would give to a distant Church the right of expostulation. Clement's language: 'If certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by Him through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger; but we shall be guiltless of this sin,' does not appear to me to indicate any official superiority of his Church, but only to be such as any Christian preacher might use in rebuking known sin. No Church was better entitled to use expostulation with another than the Church of Rome, which exercised liberality towards the rest, not only in hospitable treatment of the strangers whom business was continually drawing to the great capital, but also, as we have just seen, in direct gifts to foreign Churches. But, no doubt, this early example of successful interference must have done much to increase the *prestige* of the Church by whose exertions peace had been restored.

In Clement's Epistle such copious use is made of the Old Testament, that it may be probably inferred that the author was a Jew by birth, familiar with the book from childhood. In citing it the ordinary formulæ of Scripture quotation are used; but the books of the New Testament are treated differently. Clement shows his acquaintance with them by weaving their language into his discourse; but he does not

---

the Canon by the Council of Trent. But there is some evidence of early Church use of it. It is found in the Alexandrian MS., in the collection of hymns appended to the Psalter. It had been used by Julius Africanus (fr. 40, Routh, *Rell. Sac.* ii. 288), and it was copied into the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 21.

formally quote them as authoritative Scripture, except that he uses in this way sayings of our Lord, which, however, would seem in his use of them to derive their authority from having been spoken by Him, rather than from the book in which they were recorded.

Until lately Clement's Epistle had been only preserved in one MS. (viz., as already stated, the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament): and there not complete, for a leaf of this part of the MS. had been lost. But a few years ago notice was taken that a manuscript book in a library at Constantinople contained, among other early writings, a copy of Clement's Epistles. Its text was made known to scholars, in 1875, in an admirable edition of Clement, published by Bryennius, metropolitan then of Serrae, now of Nicomedia, a prelate whose learning does honour to the Church to which he belongs. And, strange to say, almost about the same time a third authority for the text was recovered in a Syriac version, contained in a Syriac N. T. acquired by the University of Cambridge. In this MS. Clement's Epistles regularly take the place of New Testament books, coming, as part of the Catholic Epistles, after Jude, and before the Pauline Epistles, and even furnishing lessons for Church reading.

Although I professed to treat of the Epistle of Clement, I have just used the plural number, 'Epistles,' for our MS. authorities give us two Epistles ascribed to Clement. Eusebius, who usually speaks of Clement's Epistle in the singular number, mentions (iii. 38) that there was a second Epistle which bore Clement's name, but that it had not as much circulation as the former, and that it had not been quoted by the ancients. And internal evidence shows that the second, though an early document, is later, by at least a generation, than Clement's genuine Epistle. Indeed, now that we have the document complete (for the mutilation of the Alexandrian MS. had until lately deprived us of the conclusion), we learn that it is not an Epistle at all, but a written homily intended to be publicly read in Church. The writer is distinctly a Gentile, and contrasts himself and his readers with the Jewish nation in a manner unlike the genuine Clement. And instead of confining his quotations to the Old Testament, he has

many citations from the Gospels, giving in one place the name Scripture to the source of his quotation. He used Apocryphal Gospels besides: one of his quotations we can trace to the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Yet he appears to have written before the great conflict with Gnosticism began, so that we may confidently ascribe the document to the first half of the second century.

The 'Shepherd' of Hermas.—Returning now to Eusebius's list of disputed books, I come to treat of the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. The passage quoted from the Muratorian Fragment (p. 50) testifies the high consideration in which the book was then held. Although the writer refuses to the 'Shepherd' a place in public Church reading, he lays down that it not only *might*, but *ought* to be read in private, and his language plainly indicates that, in some places at least, the Church use of the book had been such as to cause danger of its being set on a level with the Canonical Scriptures. Irenæus (iv. 20) actually quotes a passage from the book, with the words 'Well said the Scripture.' Clement of Alexandria quotes the book several times, and to all appearance fully accepts the reality and divine character of the revelations which it contains. Origen, commenting on Rom. xvi. 14, says: 'I think that this Hermas is the author of the book which is called the "Shepherd," a writing which seems to me very useful, and, as I think, divinely inspired.' But his references to the book elsewhere clearly indicate that it did not then stand on the level of the Canonical Scriptures; and he several times owns that it was not received by all.* In fact, the rise of Montanism made the Church much more cautious in the use of non-Canonical writings. It was felt that the prerogatives of Scripture were infringed on, when the utterances of modern prophets were circulated as having like claims on the acceptance of Christians. An opponent of the Montanists (Euseb. v. 16) declares that he had abstained from writing against them, lest *he* should seem to desire to add anything to the word of the Gospel of the New Testament, to which no one who is resolved to walk according to

* ἐν τῷ ὑπό τινων καταφρονουμένῳ βιβλίῳ τῷ Ποιμένι (*De Princ.* iv. 11).

the Gospel can add anything, and from which he cannot take away. This state of feeling led to a severer scrutiny of the claims of books which had been admitted into public Church use; and it is intelligible why the Muratorian writer should deprecate the Church use of a book which he believed to be not more ancient than the Episcopate of Pius. The change of feeling as to Hermas took place in the lifetime of Tertullian. In an early treatise (*De Oratione*) he disputes against certain persons who thought themselves bound to sit down at once after prayer, because Hermas is recorded to have done so. The book must evidently have enjoyed high authority when its narrative statements could thus be turned into rules of discipline. Tertullian, in reply, says nothing to disparage the authority of the book, but only contends that such an inference from it is not warranted. That the book then existed in a Latin translation may be inferred from Tertullian's describing it by its Latin name, 'Pastor,' contrary to his practice in speaking of books which he knew only in Greek. In a work written several years later, and after the rise of Montanism (*De Pudic.* 10), Tertullian contemptuously repudiates the authority of the 'Shepherd,' declaring that it was not counted worthy of being included in the Canon, but had been placed by every Council of Churches, even of the Catholic party, among false and apocryphal writings.* But that the book still continued to enjoy *some* consideration appears from Tertullian's going on to speak (*c.* 20) of the Epistle to the Hebrews as *more* received in the Churches than 'that apocryphal "Shepherd" of the adulterers.' It is worth while to copy what Eusebius says of the book (iii. 3): 'It is to be observed that this book has been disputed by some, on whose account it cannot be placed among the *homologoumena;* but by others it has been judged most necessary for those who have especial need of elementary instruction. Hence, also, we know that it has been publicly read in Churches, and I observe that

* 'Si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum etiam vestrarum inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur.' We can infer from the 'vestrarum' that the councils which condemned the Shepherd were later than the time of separation of Tertullian from the Church.

some of the most ancient writers have employed it.'* With regard to what is here said about introductory instruction, it is to be remarked that the feeling grew up that the books of Scripture were the property of the Church, and therefore could not so fitly be used in teaching those who had not yet been admitted to it. And so Athanasius (*Ep. Fest.* 39) classes the 'Shepherd,' with the teaching of the Twelve Apostles and with some of the deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament, as not canonical, but useful to be employed in catechetical instruction.† The 'Shepherd' forms part of the appendix to the Sinaitic MS.; it is also included in the list of the *Codex Claromontanus*, and some twenty Latin MSS. survive to attest that it had some circulation in the West.

The book, the history of whose reception I have sketched, consists of three parts. The first part, called 'Visions,' relates different revelations with which the author had been favoured, stating particularly the occasion and place of receiving each vision. The scene of each of these visions is laid in Rome or its neighbourhood, so that the document clearly belongs to the Roman Church. This part concludes with a narration of the vision which gives the name to the book. A man comes to Hermas in the garb of a shepherd, and tells him that he is the angel of repentance, and that he has come to dwell with him, being the guardian to whose care he has been intrusted. This 'Shepherd' then gives him, for his own instruction and that of the Church, the 'Commandments,' which form the second, and the 'Similitudes,' which form the third part of the

---

* Ἰστέον ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μὲν τινῶν ἀντιλέλεκται, δι' οὓς οὐκ ἂν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, ὑφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαιότατον οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς κέκριται, ὅθεν ἦδη καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ἴσμεν αὐτὸ δεδημοσιευμένον, καὶ τῶν παλαιοτάτων δὲ συγγραφέων κεχρημένους τινὰς αὐτῷ κατείληφα.

† Having enumerated the books of Scripture, and declared these to be the only fountains of salvation, to which none may add nor take away, he goes on to add, 'for greater accuracy,' ὅτι ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν Πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον· Σοφία Σολομῶντος καὶ Σοφία Σιρὰχ, καὶ Ἐσθὴρ, καὶ Ἰουδὶθ, καὶ Τωβίας, καὶ Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ὁ Ποιμήν. And he proceeds to distinguish the two classes of books which he has enumerated from apocryphal books, which are only the invention of heretics.

work. With regard to the general purport of these revelations, it will suffice here to state briefly that they are intended to rebuke the worldliness with which the Church had become corrupted; to predict a time of great tribulation as at hand, in which the dross should be cleared away, and to announce that there was a short intervening time during which repentance was possible, and would be accepted. The question as to the possibility of forgiveness of post-baptismal gross sin was then agitating the Church. The solution which Hermas offers is, that during that short respite the then members of the Church might obtain forgiveness. But only once: for this was an exceptional favour, and those who joined the Church afterwards must expect no other forgiveness than that which they obtained in baptism.

Concerning the date of the 'Shepherd,' received opinion still accepts the statement of the Muratorian Fragment, that the author was brother to Pius, Bishop of Rome, and wrote during his Episcopate; that is to say, about the middle of the second century. I have said (p. 52) that I myself believe that statement to be erroneous; but before discussing this point, it will be convenient to say something on some preliminary questions about which there is less room for dispute. If you consider these questions in order, you will be able to judge how far you can travel in my company.*

(1) Did the author wish his readers to believe that he had actually seen the visions, and received the revelations which he relates? Donaldson (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 326) thinks that if Hermas fancied he saw the visions he must have been silly, and if he tried to make other people believe he had

* The early date of Hermas was in recent times first seriously maintained by Zahn (*Der Hirt des Hermas*, 1868). Zahn is an authority whom it may not be safe always implicitly to follow, but who, at least, cannot be treated with disrespect. When he came forward to maintain the genuineness of the Ignatian letters he was regarded by many as the advocate of a hopeless cause; but Bishop Lightfoot's great work attests that he has won the verdict. I think he would have been more successful in gaining adherents in the present case, if the author with whom he deals were more generally read; for it appears to me that many scholars simply hold fast to the traditional opinion about a not very interesting book which they do not care to study for themselves. My own opinion was formed as the result of investigations commenced with a strong prepossession against the conclusion which I ultimately adopted.

seen them, he must have been an impostor. He prefers to think he was neither one nor other; and therefore he looks on the book as belonging to the same class as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, in which edifying lessons are conveyed through the medium of allegorical fiction, which no one is supposed to take as a record of actual facts. It is to me amazing that anyone with ordinary powers of literary perception could read the book of Hermas, and doubt that the author, impostor or not, intended his readers to take him seriously. The judgment I have quoted illustrates what I said (pp. 328, 329), that a man incapacitates himself for historical criticism, if he so takes up the modern attitude of mind towards the supernatural, as not only to disbelieve in it himself, but to be unable to conceive that men in former times felt differently. A man might now publish an edifying fiction in the form of a vision, and without taking any special precaution feel sure that his readers would not imagine he wanted them to take it as real. But in the second century a writer was bound to calculate on a different state of feeling on the part of his readers. And, in point of fact, the 'Shepherd' was for a time very generally accepted as a record of real revelations. And no critic of early times, whether he accepted the book or not, dreamed that its author wished to convey any other impression.

(2) What, then, are we to think of what Hermas, when relating the circumstances of his visions, tells about himself and his family? If the story be fiction and allegory, we have no right to suppose any of these details to be more real than the angels and towers which he sees in his visions. Nor are we even warranted in assuming that the name Hermas, ascribed to the recipient of the revelations, is that of the author himself. But both the story itself, and the manner of telling it, prove that this is no work of fiction. The author of such a work would strive to give some intelligible account of the hero of his narrative; but here Hermas, as if writing to people who knew him, gives no direct account of himself, and his story has to be deduced by piecing together several incidental notices. What we gather from them is, that Hermas had been brought to Rome as a slave; that Rhoda,

the lady to whom he had been sold, set him free, and loaded him with many benefits; that he had acquired some property, and been engaged in trade, which he owns he did not always carry on honestly; that he married a not very handsome wife, who unfortunately was not able to govern her tongue; that he had other trouble with his children, who in time of persecution denied the faith, and betrayed their parents; that he thus lost house and property, but remained steadfast in the faith, and supported himself by agricultural labour. Some have imagined that the 'Shepherd' was a romance written in the middle of the second century, but intended to have as its hero the Hermas mentioned a hundred years before in the Epistle to the Romans. But it is not credible that the author of a romance would invent for his hero such a history as I have described, representing him not even as a clergyman but a layman, an elderly married man, with an ill-conditioned wife and children. I have dwelt at length upon this point because I am persuaded that the key to all sound criticism on the 'Shepherd' is to understand thoroughly that the Hermas who tells the story is no fictitious character, but a real person, who published his visions for the edification of his contemporaries.

(3) But did he invent these visions, or did he himself believe in them? I have no hesitation in saying that he did believe in them. It is not merely that the whole book impresses me with belief in the narrator's good faith in this respect; but the stories themselves, when examined, show every mark of being, not arbitrary inventions, but attempts to record the imaginations of a dream. I take, for example, the first vision. Hermas relates that he had one day seen his former mistress, Rhoda, bathing in the Tiber, and had assisted her out of the water. And, admiring her beauty, he thought what happiness it were for him had he a wife like her in form and in disposition. Further than this his thought did not go. But soon after he had a vision. He fell asleep, and in his dream he was for a long time walking and struggling on ground so rugged and broken that it was impossible to pass. At length he succeeded in crossing the water by which his path had been washed away, and coming into

smooth ground, knelt down to confess his sins to God. Then the heavens were opened, and he saw Rhoda saluting him from the sky. On asking her what she did there, she told him that she had been taken up to accuse him before the Lord, who was angry with him for having sinned against her. He asks her, How? Had he ever spoken a lewd word to her? Had he not always treated her with honour and respect? She owns it, but accuses him of having entertained an evil thought, and tells him of the sin of evil thoughts, and their punishment. Then the heavens were closed, and he was left shuddering with fear, not knowing how he could escape the judgment of God if such a thought as his were marked as sin. Then he sees a venerable lady sitting in a great white chair, with a book in her hands. She asks why he who was usually so cheerful is now so sad. On his telling her, she owns what a sin any impure thought would be in one so singleminded, and so innocent as he; but she assures him it is not for this God is angry with him, but because of the sins of his children, whom he, through false indulgence, had allowed to corrupt themselves; but to whom repentance was still open, if he would warn them. Then she reads to him out of her book: of the greater part he can remember nothing, save that it was severe and menacing; but he remembers the last sentence, which was mild and consoling. She leaves him with the words, 'Play the man, Hermas.'

Now, if we take this story as allegorical fiction, it is impossible to assign a meaning to it. There is not a word more about Rhoda through the whole book. Why has she been introduced? What is she intended to represent? Why should Hermas be first told that God was angry with him on one account, and then be told that it was really on another account God was angry? On the other hand, the want of logical connexion between the parts of the story is explained at once if we take his own word that it was a dream. There is no difficulty in believing that he had seen Rhoda as he tells, and that the thought he had entertained presented itself to him afterwards in his sleep as a sin. It is quite like a dream that Rhoda, as principal figure, should fade out, and be replaced by another; that sensations of physical distress

in his sleep should suggest the ideas, first of walking on and on without being able to find an outlet; afterwards of mental distress at words spoken to him; and altogether like a dream, too, that he should imagine himself to have heard a long discourse, yet be able to tell nothing of it but the words heard just before awakening. It therefore seems to me quite false criticism to put any other interpretation on the story told by Hermas than that his 'visions' commenced in the manner he describes, by his having what we should call a very vivid dream. He was much impressed by it, and when, in the following year, he dreamed again of the lady and her book, he regarded it as a divine communication, and set himself, by fasting and prayer, to obtain new revelations. As might be expected, more visions followed, and he made himself known to his Church as favoured with Divine revelations. I see no reason for doubting the truth of this story, though I naturally think that the visions of Hermas gained a good deal in coherence when he came to write them down. I believe, also, that the last two sections of his work contain records of his waking thoughts, which he regarded as inspired by an angel who, he had persuaded himself, had come permanently to dwell with him. The conclusion, then, at which I arrive is, that the work of Hermas is not to be classed with Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, but rather with the revelations of St. Teresa, St. Francesca Romana, St. Gertrude, St. Catherine of Siena, and other literature of the same kind, of which there is such abundance in the Roman Catholic Church.

Are we, then, who do not believe in the revelations of Hermas, to set him down as a crazy person, and to regard those who believed in him as fools? The examples I have just cited may make us hesitate before coming to such a conclusion. St. Teresa, for instance, visionary as she was, did much useful work, and exhibited a large amount of practical good sense. In respect of sobriety, the visions of Hermas contrast very favourably with some of the other literature with which I have compared them. I will not discuss the vision of Col. Gardiner, which was accepted as real by Dr. Doddridge, nor need I remind you how many persons who can by no means be described as fools have thought it worth

while to record remarkable dreams, under the belief that supernatural intimations might thus have been given. But if you think that the Church of Rome was in the beginning of the second century too easy in its reception of the revelations of Hermas, I will ask you to bear in mind that the men of that age are not to be scorned because their views as to God's manner of governing His Church were different from what the experience of so many following centuries has taught us. We all believe that in the time of our Lord and His Apostles a great manifestation of the supernatural was made to the world. How long, and to what extent, similar manifestations would present themselves in the ordinary life of the Church, only experience could show. Again, if we are able to give a natural explanation of some mental phenomena which were once thought to indicate supernatural interference, it is no disgrace to men of early times that they were not acquainted with modern philosophy. Even in the Church of Rome, though we may think it gives credence too lightly to modern miracles, a visionary would now receive from her spiritual guides instruction as to the possibility of deception, and as to the need of caution, for which, in the second century, no necessity might be felt.

(4) I come, then, to the question, Did Hermas see his visions in the Episcopate of Clement? He himself plainly intimates that he did. For he states that in his vision he received the following instructions:—'You shall write two books, and send one to Clement and one to Grapte. And Grapte shall admonish the widows and orphans, and Clement shall send it to foreign cities, for to him that office has been committed. And you shall relate it to the presbyters of the Church.' The natural inference from this passage is, that at the time of the vision Grapte was what we may describe as chief deaconess of the Roman Church, and that Clement was the organ by which it communicated with foreign Churches. And we have every reason to think that he was so described on account of the celebrity gained not long before by his letter sent to a distant Church. Different ways have been devised of escaping this inference. I really don't know whether we are to count Origen as rejecting the obvious meaning of the

passage, though he does manage to find an allegory in it. He treats (*De Princip.* iv. 11) of three modes of interpreting Scripture, corresponding to the tripartite nature of man—body, soul, and spirit. And he imagines that he finds them indicated in this passage, Grapte, who instructs those of lowest spiritual discernment, being the literal interpretation, and Clement and Hermas himself representing the two higher methods of interpretation. A solution more acceptable to modern habits of thought is that a real Clement is intended, only not the Clement who wrote the Epistle to the Corinthians. But it must be pronounced extremely improbable that within a comparatively few years of the writing of that letter there should be another Clement, whose function it also was to communicate on behalf of the Church of Rome with foreign Churches, but who has left on ecclesiastical history no trace of his existence.* A third solution is that Hermas, no doubt, wished his readers to believe that he saw his visions in the Episcopate of the well-known Clement; but he was telling a lie: he really wrote forty or fifty years later. But we cannot adopt this solution unless we abandon the results we have already obtained. If the work is a mere fiction, the imaginary hero may have lived under Clement, and the real author when you please; and his name may or may not have been Hermas. But if he was a man who told his contemporaries of visions, real or pretended, which he claimed to have seen himself, it would be absurd of him to destroy his chance of being believed, by asserting that he saw the vision at a time when it was notorious that he had either not been born, or could have been only a child. It is to be remembered that the vision represents him to have been then an elderly married man, with a grown-up family. I must add, that Hermas had no motive whatever for antedating his work. His prophecy announced tribulation close at hand, and only a short intervening period for repentance. It would be absolutely con-

* On the method of solving historical difficulties by imagining for real characters duplicates unknown to history, the reader may consult S. R. Maitland's tenth letter on Fox. If he does not know it already, he will thank me for the reference.

trary to his interest to pretend that the prophecy had been delivered forty or fifty years previously. All his readers would then know that the prediction had failed, for nothing had come of it. And the promise of forgiveness, which excluded all those baptized after the date of the prophecy, would not be applicable at all to the generation to which the book was offered. I therefore find it impossible to resist the evidence afforded by this passage, that Hermas must have attained to middle life before the death of Clement. I may claim Bishop Lightfoot as agreeing with me in this result; for he repeatedly speaks of Hermas as a younger contemporary of Clement (*Philippians*, p. 167; *Clement*, p. 1, &c.).

When this result has been adopted, the main question may be regarded as settled. For the remaining point in dispute concerns not the date of Hermas, but the credit due to the Muratorian writer.

(5) If we admit that the vision was seen in the Episcopate of Clement, can we accept the Muratorian statement that Hermas wrote the 'Shepherd' while his brother, the Bishop Pius, sat in the chair of the Church of the city of Rome? Lightfoot thinks we can; and he suggests modes of reconcilement, which, indeed, I tried for a long time myself before I could persuade myself to abandon the Muratorian statement altogether. Hermas may have been considerably the older of the two brothers: perhaps we may give up half the Muratorian statement, and believe that he was the brother of Pius, but not that it was *during his Episcopate* he wrote the 'Shepherd;' perhaps if we had the Greek of the Muratorian fragment we might not find that assertion there. Then, again, we have not such certain knowledge of the dates of early Roman Episcopates as to forbid our manipulating them a little. Could we not screw up the date of Pius somewhat, and screw down the date of Clement? Possibly we could bring down the date of the death of Clement as late as 110; and perhaps we might bring up the accession of Pius earlier than 139, which Lipsius names as the earliest admissible date. But I abandoned these attempts when I saw that a real reconcilement with the Muratorian writer was in the nature of things impossible. His object was to prove Hermas to be

quite a modern personage. How could he be that if he had attained the age of forty before the death of Clement?

Let us inquire, then, if we are bound to reconcile ourselves with this writer. Who was he? Had he any real knowledge of the events of the Episcopate of Pius? Critics confess themselves unable to answer the former question, and the majority of those who accept his statement about Hermas answer the second question in the negative. He describes Pius as 'sitting in the chair of the Church of the city Rome,' and evidently has no suspicion that the constitution of that Church was different in the days of Pius and in his own. But in Hermas the honour of a 'chair' is not confined to a single person, and the critics of whom I speak imagine that Episcopacy was only then struggling, against much opposition, into existence. If the Muratorian writer knew nothing of such a patent fact as the constitution of the Church in the days of Pius, he cannot be an authority as to the date of publication of a book which must have appeared, if not before, at the very beginning of that episcopate. I have elsewhere* given my reasons for thinking that the Muratorian Fragment is a document not earlier than the episcopate of Zephyrinus, that is to say, the beginning of the third century; and I will now mention my theory as to the discovery that the author of the 'Shepherd' was brother of Pius. This discovery is found also in a note appended to a very ancient catalogue of the bishops of Rome. Many good critics have thought that the earlier part of this catalogue was derived from a list made by Hippolytus of the bishops of Rome down to his time, which formed part† of his *Chronology*. My theory, then, is that

* Smith's *Dict. Chr. Biography*, articles, MURATORIAN FRAGMENT, MONTANISM.

† It was with much timidity that, in 1874, I named Hippolytus as probably the author of the work of which the Muratorian Fragment is a part; and hitherto my theory has found little acceptance. But I may now count Bishop Lightfoot as disposed to give his adherence. In a letter to the *Academy* (Sept. 21, 1889), he makes the luminous suggestion that the original of this Fragment was in verse, a supposition which throws great light on some characteristics of the document; and he justifies the suggestion by actual translation into Greek iambics of several passages of the Fragment. Now, among the works of Hippolytus, the titles of which are inscribed on his chair, is ᾠδαὶ εἰς πάσας τὰς γραφάς; and Lightfoot's idea is that we are to understand by this, verses on the Canon of O. T. and N. T. Scripture, of which verses the Fragment represents a part.

Hippolytus, in the course of the investigations necessary for framing this list, ascertained that Bishop Pius had a brother named Hermas, and that he then jumped to the conclusion (as he was a man quite capable of doing) that this Hermas was the author of the 'Shepherd.' Whether this theory of mine be true or not, I hold that whatever conclusions as to the date of the 'Shepherd' we draw from a study of the document itself ought not to be laid aside in deference to the authority of a writer concerning whose means of information we really know nothing. If no more be granted than Lightfoot has conceded, the date is quite early in the second century, and the 'Shepherd' therefore deserves the highest attention from the student of Church history. And, if it be read without any prepossession to the contrary, I am persuaded that its contents will be found entirely to correspond with that early date, since it reveals an immaturity of development both in respect of doctrine and of Church organization.

The length of the discussion necessary to establish the date of Hermas precludes me from treating of many interesting questions raised by the contents of the book; and I will only say something as to what we may gather from it as to Church organization. It has been the bane of ecclesiastical history that so many have studied it only in the hope to gain from it some weapon which might be used in modern controversies. It is natural to think that if parity of presbyters had been the Church's original rule, the government of a single head could not have been established without some resistance on the part of those who were dispossessed of their equal authority. It has been hoped to find some exception to the almost total silence of Church history as to such resistance, in the language in which Hermas rebukes the strifes for precedence among Christians. I think I am without prejudice in this matter; for I find it much easier to prove from Scripture that individual Christians are bound to submit to the established order of the Church than to prove that the Church had been bound to develop its organization in one particular way. And for me it has only a speculative interest to enquire what was the process by which the Church arrived at the state

of things that we find when Church history first comes into clear light at the end of the second century, at which time we find bishops everywhere, and no memory that there had ever been any other form of Church government. But as far as I can see, the question whether one presbyter had pre-eminence over others was one in which Hermas took no interest, and on which he tells us nothing. He clearly distinguishes himself from the presbyters, and makes no claim to be one of their body. But he has something to tell us about the 'prophets,' the class to which, I have no hesitation in saying, he himself belonged. The Church had then its authorized teachers and rulers; but we learn from *Mandat.* xi. that there were, besides, 'prophets,' or as we may call them, lay preachers. Such a prophet was permitted to give exhortation in the public meetings for worship.* After the intercessory prayer had been made, the angel of the prophetic spirit would fill the man, and he would give exhortation to the people as the Lord willed. It is a mark of the antiquity of our document that it indicates that 'gifted' persons were still permitted, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 26, to speak in the Church. It can readily be imagined that the interference of the rulers of the Church would sometimes be necessary to suppress indiscreet or erroneous teaching. It strikes me as possible that the rebellion in the Church of Corinth, where, even in St. Paul's time, spiritual gifts had been exercised without due regard to order, may have originated in an unsuccessful interference of authority with some leading prophets. It was soon found expedient to confine the work of exhortation to the Church's authorized teachers. When, towards the end of the second century, the Montanists brought prophesying again into prominence, precedents in their favour were neither numerous nor then very recent; and it was found that the inspired authority which these prophets claimed threatened to be subversive of all Church order and fixity of doctrine. Hermas belonged to an age when the exercise of prophetic gifts was not dis-

* In Hermas, as in St. James's Epistle, the Christian community is ἡ ἐκκλησία, the assembly for worship, ἡ συναγωγή.

couraged by the Church authorities; but he is distinctly pre-Montanist. I have already mentioned how repugnant his teaching was to the Montanist Tertullian. Hermas occasionally gives indications of some little jealousy* of the superior dignity of the presbyters. Thus, in one vision, the Church, who appears to him in the form of a lady, bids him sit down. 'Nay,' he modestly answers, 'let the presbyters be seated first.' 'Sit down, as I bid you,' the lady replies. But his chief anxiety is to guard the office of prophet from being intruded on by unworthy persons. Some, it would appear, claimed to be prophets in the modern sense of the word: persons would visit them, ask them questions about their private affairs, and pay money for their advice; and Hermas states that their predictions would occasionally turn out right. But he urges that the Spirit of God does not speak in answer to questions; that is to say, when man wishes Him to speak, but when He Himself chooses to speak. These false pretenders, so ready to prophesy in a corner, are dumb when they come into the Church assembly. Their whole manner of life must distinguish the true prophet from the false: the one is meek, humble, easily contented; not talkative, ambitious, greedy, luxurious, like the other.

The circulation which the work of Hermas obtained gives us reason to think that his own claims as a prophet were admitted by his Church, and that the record of his visions was sent to foreign Churches as he desired. But I can well believe that there had been some hesitation as to recognizing him, and thus that a little soreness of feeling on his part may have arisen. For, though a pious man, he does not appear to have been a well-instructed one; and some of his doctrinal teaching, which is not accurate when judged by the standard of our day, may well have been thought unsatisfactory by the presbyters of his own. He does not formally quote the scriptures either of Old or New Testament; nor does he make much use of either, his coincidences being closest with the Epistle of St. James. It is very possible that he came

* Those who take Hermas for a fictitious character are blind to the amusing little touches of human nature which constantly show themselves.

from the Jewish section of the Church; but, in his work, there is not a trace, not to say of anti-Paulinism, but even of Judaism. In his teaching the Jewish nation has no special prerogative; and even the 'twelve tribes' are only the various nations which make up the Christian Church.

Hermas and Theodotion.—Something, however, must be said as to the use made by Hermas of one Old Testament passage; because it has been imagined to afford an argument subversive of the conclusions I have arrived at as to the early date of the work. In the visions of Hermas (IV. ii. 4) he sees a terrible wild beast, from which he is delivered by the protection of 'the angel who is over the beasts, whose name is Thegri.' This Thegri, of whom no one else makes mention, had been a puzzle to commentators until not long since, when the solution was obtained by Mr. Rendel Harris (*Johns Hopkins' University Circulars*, iii. 75). He compares the words in Hermas, ὁ κύριος ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν θηρίων ὄντα, οὗ τὸ ὄνομά ἐστι Θεγρί, καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἵνα μή σε λυμάνῃ, with the words of Daniel vi. 22, ὁ θεός μου ἀπέστειλε τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνέφραξε τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων, καὶ οὐκ ἐλυμήναντό με, when the use of Daniel by Hermas is seen beyond mistake. But, in the original, the verb corresponding to ἐνέφραξεν is סָגַר; and it becomes apparent that we must correct Θεγρί into Ċεγρί, and understand 'the angel who stops the mouths of the beasts.'

This remark by Mr. Harris led to a further remark by Dr. Hort. He pointed out (*Johns Hopkins' University Circulars*, iv. 23) that the strong coincidence between Hermas and the Book of Daniel only exists when Theodotion's version of the latter book is used. The corresponding verse in the LXX. merely has σέσωκέ με ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων. In another place, indeed, it has ὁ θεὸς ἀπέκλεισε τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων; but it neither has ἐνέφραξεν, nor does it use the verb λυμαίνομαι. It follows that Hermas used, not the LXX. version of Daniel, but that of Theodotion; and, therefore, that we must take it as a fixed point in our discussions about the date of Hermas, that he is later than Theodotion; and Theodotion is commonly believed to have made his version in the latter half of the second century.

Now, let me say in the outset, that conclusions drawn from the study of the character of an entire book are not to be lightly displaced by an argument founded on a single passage. Thus, when treating of the genuineness of 1 Thessalonians, I did not think it worth while to discuss the ingenious little argument which Holsten (see note p. 396) founded on *ch.* i. 3. In the present case we have in our hands the whole Book of Hermas, containing many notes of time; but we have no trustworthy information as to the date of Theodotion's version, and (what is of more importance) we have no sufficient information what other Greek versions there may have been antecedent to his. We are, therefore, on much firmer ground if we use Hermas to throw light on the history of Greek translations of the Book of Daniel than *vice versâ*. Obviously, we cannot infer from coincidence in a single verse that Hermas was later than Theodotion, if it is possible that in that verse Theodotion himself was but following the lines of an older translator. And that (not to mention Aquila's version, concerning whose rendering of this verse we have no information) there was, in point of fact, such an older translation, has been made almost certain by investigations, on which Dr. Gwynn at first entered for my assistance in dealing with the present question, and which he afterwards carried on on his own account, and the results of which he has published in his articles SYMMACHUS and THEODOTION, in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

One preliminary consideration may be mentioned, which may lead us to suspect that there must be some flaw in this argument for the later date of Hermas. The argument proves a little too much; it proves that the Epistle to the Hebrews was also written late in the second century. When the writer of that Epistle uses the phrase (xi. 33), 'stopped the mouths of lions,' we can scarcely doubt that he had Dan. vi. 22 in his mind. We may also take it as certain that he used a Greek, not a Hebrew, Bible. But, if it was the Septuagint version of Daniel that he used, how came he to stumble on the word ἔφραξαν instead of the ἀπέκλεισε of the LXX.?

The knowledge which the Christian Church has possessed of Greek translations of the Bible was principally, if not ex-

clusively, derived from Origen's great work the 'Tetrapla.' In the first column of that work he published the version of Aquila, noted for its slavish literalness and ruthless sacrifice of Greek to Hebrew idioms; in the second column, the version of Symmachus, marked by greater purity of Greek; in the third column, the Septuagint; in the fourth, the version of Theodotion, who is said to have been less an independent translator than a reviser of former translations. These were not the only translations which had been made before the time of Origen; for he recovered and published fragments of two or three other versions; but these alone had reached him unmutilated. Of these four, the Septuagint alone is regarded as pre-Christian. Aquila's, which is accounted the oldest of the others, is said to have been characterized by an animus hostile to Christianity, and to have been intended to deprive the Christians of the use of certain O. T. texts on which they had founded arguments. The Septuagint was the Greek version which was used in the Christian Church, and was regarded as inspired by many of the Fathers who accepted a miraculous account of its origin. But there was one remarkable exception, the Book of Daniel. St. Jerome states repeatedly that the Christian Church used, not the Septuagint translation of the Book of Daniel, but that of Theodotion. For example, in the preface to his translation of the Book of Daniel, he says: 'Danielem Prophetam juxta LXX. interpretes, Domini Salvatoris Ecclesiæ non legunt, utentes Theodotionis editione; et hoc cur acciderit, nescio. Sive quia sermo Chaldaicus est, et quibusdam proprietatibus a nostro eloquio discrepat, noluerunt LXX. interpretes easdem linguæ lineas in translatione servare; sive sub nomine eorum ab alio, nescio quo, non satis Chaldæam linguam sciente, editus est liber; sive aliud quid causæ extiterit ignorans, hoc unum affirmare possum, quod multum a veritate discordet et recto judicio repudiatus sit' (see also the Preface to the Commentary on the Book of Daniel, the Prologue to Joshua, and *Apol. cont. Ruf.* ii. 33). Thus it appears that Jerome, who was acquainted with the Tetrapla of Origen, took notice that the version of the Book of Daniel in use in the Church of his day was that given in the Tetrapla, not in the Septuagint column, but in

the column which presented the version of Thedotion. Jerome is a perfectly competent witness to this matter of fact, though he professes himself unable to offer any but conjectural explanations of it, and though we are unable to accept the explanations which he does give. It would appear that Origen said nothing to throw light on it; though Jerome quotes him as having, at least on one occasion, given, by his example, his countenance to the desertion of the Septuagint for Theodotion: 'Judicio magistrorum ecclesiæ editio eorum (LXX.) in hoc volumine repudiata est, et Theodotionis vulgo legitur; quæ et Hebræo et ceteris translatoribus congruit, unde et Origenes in nono Stromatum volumine asserit se quæ sequuntur ab hoc loco in Propheta Daniele, non juxta LXX., qui multum ab Hebraica veritate discordant, sed juxta Theodotionis editionem disserere' (*in Dan.* iv. 5).

It is, accordingly, Theodotion's version of Daniel which is ordinarily found in Greek Bibles; but the version which stood in the Septuagint column of Origen's Tetrapla has been recovered from a single MS., preserved in the Chigi Library, and was printed at Rome in 1772. It will be found appended to Tischendorf's second and subsequent editions of the Septuagint. An extant Syriac version, and the citations of Jerome, fully establish its claim to be Origen's Septuagint.* The Roman edition contains a comparison of the variations between the two versions, and a comparison will also be found in the Appendix to Pusey's *Daniel the Prophet*, p. 606.

Now, to speak first of the date of Theodotion's version, Epiphanius, the earliest writer who gives a date, places it so late, that if Hermas used it, so far from living early in the second century, he could not even have lived in the Episcopate of Pius. In the passage referred to (*De Menss. et Pondd.*, 17), which treats of Greek translations of the Bible, whatever may have been the errors for which Epiphanius is himself responsible, they have been so largely added to by his transcribers, that his Greek text, as printed by Petavius, exhibits a really stupendous mass of blunders. Dr. Gwynn,

* The claim is made in the subscription: Δανιὴλ κατὰ τοὺς ὁ. ἐγράφη ἐξ ἀντιγράφου ἔχοντος τὴν ὑποσημείωσιν ταύτην· ἐγράφη ἐκ τῶν τετραπλῶν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ παρετέθη.

however, found on consulting, at the British Museum, a Syriac translation, bearing date before A.D. 660,* that the worst of these blunders can be cleared away; and of those that remain we may charitably believe that some had arisen through negligence of transcribers before the Syriac translation was made. It turns out that Epiphanius means to say that the translation of Symmachus was made in the reign of Marcus Aurelius; and that the translation of Theodotion was made in the following reign, that of Commodus.†

Epiphanius, however, is a writer whose unsupported statements must be received with great caution (see p. 168). I need not inquire how many of his blunders arose from erroneous information, how many from a habit of supplying by invention the defects of his information. In the present case, he is peculiarly untrustworthy, being, on several points, contradicted by older and better authorities. He makes Symmachus an apostate from Samaritanism to Judaism; whereas he really was an Ebionite, as we learn from Eusebius (vi. 17), who had met with a work of his in defence of that heresy. Again, he tells that Theodotion was a native of Pontus, and had been a disciple of Marcion until he became a proselyte to Judaism, when he learned the Hebrew language. But we learn from Irenæus that Theodotion was really an Ephesian; and we can have little doubt that Epiphanius has mixed up Theodotion with another translator of the Old Testament, Aquila, who was a native of Pontus, and of whom also the story is told that he had been a Christian before he became a proselyte to Judaism. And it would seem to be for no better reason than because he has placed Theodotion at Pontus, that Epiphanius makes him a disciple of the great Pontic heresiarch, Marcion. With respect to his dates, he has certainly placed Theodotion too late in naming the reign of Commodus (180–192). For Irenæus, who wrote in the beginning of that reign, speaks (iii. 21) of the versions of Aquila and Theodotion, and as we

* This translation has been published by De Lagarde, *Vet. Test. ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque*, Göttingen, 1880.

† Accordingly, the Paschal Chronicle, following Epiphanius, places the publication of Theodotion's version in the consulship of Marcellus and Ælianus, that is, in the year 184.

shall presently see, his use of the latter translation is such as to show that it could not then have been recent. On the other hand, Epiphanius has placed Symmachus too early; for Irenæus does not mention him; and so it is probable that he, and not Theodotion, was the latest of the three translators just named. Symmachus was but an older contemporary of Origen, both having had personal acquaintance with the same lady, Juliana (Euseb., as above). Epiphanius appears to have jumped to the conclusion that Symmachus was antecedent to Theodotion, from the fact that, in Origen's columns, the versions stood in the order, Aquila, Symmachus, LXX., Theodotion, which Origen certainly did not intend as a chronological arrangement. We must, therefore, dismiss Epiphanius's whole account of Greek translations, as being absolutely without historical value. It may not be all pure invention; but we have no means of disentangling the grains of truth it may possibly contain. When we have rejected the testimony of Epiphanius, we are left without any precise information as to the date of Theodotion; but I have no wish to dispute the common opinion that he lived in the second century, because the question with which we are really concerned is whether he did more than revise a previous translation different from the Chigi Septuagint.

Though it is only within very wide limits we can tell when Theodotion lived, we can assign a later limit to the time when his version of the Book of Daniel came into use in the Christian Church. Its use was not due, as some supposed, to the influence of Origen, but is to be found in the previous century. Overbeck has carefully examined (*Quæst. Hippol. Specimen*, p. 105) the quotations from Daniel made by Irenæus in his great work on heresies, with the result of finding that Irenæus habitually uses the version of Theodotion, not that of the LXX. Since we know the greater part of Irenæus only through the medium of a Latin translation, it might be objected that the quotations only inform us as to the version in use in the time of the translator, and not as to that used by Irenæus himself. Overbeck, therefore, has pointed out three passages in particular where the argument of Irenæus turns on words peculiar to Theodotion's version. These are the

quotations of Dan. xii. 7, in IV. xxvi. 1; of Dan. ii. 44, in V. xx. 1, and V. xxvi. 2. In a citation of Dan. xii. 9, 10, which Irenæus (I. xvi.) reports as made by the Marcosians, there is a conflation of the two versions. In accepting Overbeck's result, we must guard ourselves by leaving the possibility open that what Irenæus used was not Theodotion's translation, but an older version closely followed by Theodotion. And when we speak of a 'conflation,' we must always bear in mind the possibility that the so-called conflation may in truth be the earliest document, which may have been partially followed by two independent subsequent writers.

Overbeck has also studied the citations in the work of Hippolytus on Antichrist, and finds, as might be expected from the fact that Hippolytus was a hearer of Irenæus, that he also used the version of Theodotion. This result is confirmed by Bardenhewer's study of the remains of the work of Hippolytus on Daniel, his report being that Hippolytus not only used the version of Theodotion, but seems ignorant of any other, and that his interpretation sometimes directly contradicts the Septuagint version. Overbeck arrives further at the conclusion that Clement of Alexandria used Theodotion's version (see the passages from Dan. ix., quoted by Clement, that are given by Archbishop Ussher in his *Syntagma de* LXX. *interprett. Versione*).

On the other hand, Justin Martyr (*Trypho* 31) gives a long quotation from Dan. vii., in which the agreements with the Chigi version are so numerous as to preclude the explanation that they result from casual coincidence; and I myself hastily concluded at first that Justin used no other version. But a more careful examination shows that Justin's text exhibits also a number of divergences from the Chigi version, and that in many, though not in all, of these it agrees with Theodotion's. This was observed by Wetstein (*Prolegg. in N. T.*, p. 64, edit. 1730), who, anticipating Dr. Hort in the use of the principle that coincidence with Theodotion proves a writer to be later than Theodotion, drew the inference that the *Trypho* could not be the work of Justin. Stroth (*ap.* Eichhorn, *Repert.* ii. 75), accepting the same principle, inferred that Theodotion must have been earlier than Justin.

But Credner (*Beiträge*, ii. 261–272) gave what I take to be the true explanation, viz. that there must have been an older translation of which both Justin and Theodotion made use.

The citations by Tertullian prove that the so-called LXX. version was accepted as such in Africa at the time that the early Latin translation there used was made. In one work, ascribed to Tertullian, the treatise *Adv. Judæos*, Theodotion's version is used. A single example will suffice as illustration. The words (Dan. x. 11) translated in our version, 'O Daniel, a man greatly beloved,' are rendered in the LXX. Δανιήλ, ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινὸς εἶ; but by Theodotion, ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν. Now in *De Jejun.* 9, the passage is quoted in the form, 'Daniel, homo es miserabilis;' but in *Adv. Judæos* 9, 'Vir desideriorum tu es.' The difference here pointed out goes to confirm Neander's suspicions that the section in which these citations occur is not genuine.* But the treatise against the Jews, if written by Tertullian, must have been one of his latest works, and full forty years later than the treatise of Irenæus. It might seem more likely than not that in that interval of time Theodotion's Daniel, which was habitually used by Irenæus, would have been made by translation accessible to Latin-speaking Christians. Cyprian shows acquaintance with both versions, using, for instance, the LXX. form of Dan. ii. 35, *Test.* ii. 17; but ordinarily Theodotion: see, for example, Dan. xii. 4, in *Test.* i. 4.

In view of the facts which have been stated, I find it

* Neander's main ground for suspicion (*Antignosticus*, ii. 530, Bohn) is that the treatise against the Jews has several passages in common with the third book against Marcion, which cohere with the context in the latter work, not in the former. It is clear, therefore, that the author of the former treatise borrowed these passages; but I hesitate to say that we can thence infer he was not Tertullian; for it is common with voluminous writers to save themselves trouble by turning to new account what they had written on a former occasion. I have myself pointed out (*Hermathena*, i. 103) that the use made (chap. 8) of the chronology of Hippolytus proves that the treatise against the Jews cannot be much earlier than A.D. 230, a time however when, there is reason to believe, Tertullian was still in literary activity.

Noeldechen, in his chronological arrangement of the writings of Tertullian (Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 2) places the treatise against the Jews quite early among the works of Tertullian (viz. about A.D. 195); but his reasons seem to me quite outweighed by those here given.

impossible to accept the received opinion, founded on the authority of the passage in Jerome already quoted, that the Christian Churches up to the middle of the second century used the LXX. version of the Book of Daniel, and afterwards rejected it and replaced it by Theodotion's. St. Jerome, it will be observed, does not profess to have any historical tradition of such a rejection, but merely attests the fact that in his time Theodotion's version was in universal use. But when could such a rejection have taken place, and how could it take place both universally and silently? It must have taken place before the time of Irenæus, who, as we have said, used a version substantially the same as Theodotion's. I have rejected Epiphanius's statement that Theodotion and Irenæus both worked in the same emperor's short reign; but unless current opinion as to the date of Theodotion's version be widely mistaken, it must have been quite a modern one in the days of Irenæus. And it was the work not of a Christian, but of a Jewish proselyte. Now Irenæus (III. xxi.) believed in the divine inspiration of the seventy interpreters; and in the chapter to which I refer his object is to establish that, in comparison with their work, the versions of Aquila and Theodotion have no authority deserving of regard. Is it then credible that he should, without a word of explanation, sweep away an entire book of the Bible of these venerated translators, and replace it by the work of an enemy of the Church? Is it not strange, too, that the upstart version should meet as much acceptance in Alexandria as in Gaul? And, again, is it not strange that it should be Theodotion, who of all the ancient interpreters followed most closely the lines of the LXX., and is supposed to have been least acquainted with Hebrew or Chaldee, who should have cast the LXX. completely aside, and made a totally independent translation? I am therefore disposed to believe not only that Theodotion followed the lines of an older version,* and that this was the one used by Irenæus; but also that this

* Dr. Gwynn has noted a verse (x. 6) in the LXX. Daniel, which affords ground for a suspicion that it was based on a former version, in points at least approaching to Theodotion's. There is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης; but this rendering might be accounted for as an editorial re-writing of τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θάρσις, a literal rendering of the Hebrew preserved by Theodotion. The rendering of

older version was what Irenæus recognized as the Septuagint. In fact, our common use of the phrase 'the Septuagint' attributes to that work greater unity than it really possesses. Critics are now agreed that the different books included in it were not all translated by the same hands or at the same time; so that it is really not a single version, but a collection of different versions. If a purchaser now asks for a copy of the Septuagint, the book that goes by that name, which the bookseller will offer him, will contain, not the Chigi version of Daniel, but Theodotion's version. May it not be the case that Irenæus and Clement had no intention of superseding the Septuagint, but only that the collection to which they gave the name of Septuagint, instead of the Chigi Daniel (which was accepted as part of the Septuagint in Palestine, where Justin Martyr lived and where Origen made his Hexapla), contained a different version; probably not Theodotion's, but the version which was the basis of Theodotion's revision? If this older version was in substantial agreement with Theodotion's, the substitution of the latter version in Church use might easily take place silently.

At all events, an examination of the Chigi Daniel will make it appear intensely improbable that this could have been the only version through which the Book of Daniel was known to Greek-speaking Jews until the second century after Christ. For this version is not so much a translation as a free reproduction of its original, bearing to Theodotion's version the same relation that the Apocryphal First Book of Esdras bears to the corresponding portions of the Canonical Scriptures. Dr. Gwynn's conjecture seems to me well worthy of consideration, that the Apocryphal Esdras and the Chigi Daniel may have had the same author. There is one remarkable coincidence between them: *ἀπηρείσατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλείῳ αὐτοῦ* (1 Esdras ii. 10; Dan. i. 2). And the two works resemble each other, not merely in continual arbitrary changes

---

Tharshish by *θάλασσα*, though quite exceptional in the LXX., is found once Is. ii. 16, and has rabbinical authority: see also Jerome's Commentary *in loc.*; but it seems impossible to account for *στόμα*, except as a corruption of *σῶμα*. Dr. Gwynn observes also that the mistranslation *σπανίσαι* for 'seal' (Dan. ix. 24) can scarcely be accounted for except as a corruption of the *σφραγίσαι* preserved by Theodotion.

from the original, but in both containing ornamental additions. As the Greek Daniel adds to the Chaldee the stories of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon, so the Greek Esdras adds the story of the three young men at the Court of King Darius. The latter even contains a hymn after the pattern of the 'Song of the Three Children,' though on a much smaller scale. And, though the Book of Esdras had not the good fortune to be admitted into the Canon of the Council of Trent, no part of the deutero-canonical books has received more extensive Patristic recognition than the story just cited. The Apocryphal Esdras may very possibly be an older translation than the Canonical Ezra; for the latter is a separate book from that of Chronicles; but to all appearance they had formed one book when the translation of the Apocryphal Book was made; and that this was the original form of the Hebrew may be gathered from the identity of the last verse of Chronicles with the first verse of Ezra. This difference of form of the two Greek books prevented them from being taken as different translations of the same book; and so both passed as distinct books into the Greek Bible under the names of First and Second Esdras. But, if the range of contents of the two books had been the same, it might well have happened that the Apocryphal Esdras might have been placed by Origen in his Septuagint column, and the Canonical Esdras in the Theodotion column; and then we should have a parallel to what has happened in the case of the two versions of Daniel.

I have just said that it is more probable than not that, long before the second century after Christ, the Chisian version should have had to encounter the rivalry of a more faithful translation; and it might perhaps be supposed that the facts already brought forward could be explained by pushing back the date of Theodotion's translation to the early part of the second century. But a table, drawn up by Dr. Gwynn, of the New Testament citations of Daniel with the corresponding renderings in Theodotion, and in the so-called Septuagint, proves decisively the existence of a version different from the Chisian, at an earlier date than it is possible to imagine Theodotion to have lived. Instead of this table exhibiting

an exclusive use of the Chisian version, it is really surprising how little evidence it affords that that version was even known to the N. T. writers, though it must certainly have been in existence long before their time. I have already referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Apocalypse is the N. T. book which makes most use of the Book of Daniel. In that book the result of the comparison is, that there are several passages in which St. John does not use the LXX., and does approach nearer to Theodotion; and that there is nothing decisive the other way. So that I actually find in the Apocalypse no clear evidence that St. John had ever seen the so-called LXX. version. The following are some of the passages in question:—

(1) Rev ix. 20: *τὰ εἴδωλα τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ λίθινα καὶ τὰ ξύλινα ἃ οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται οὔτε ἀκούειν οὔτε περιπατεῖν.* There is not a word of this in the LXX.; but Theodotion has, Dan. v. 23, *τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς χρυσοῦς καὶ ἀργυροῦς καὶ χαλκοῦς καὶ σιδηροῦς καὶ ξυλίνους καὶ λιθίνους, οἳ οὐ βλέπουσι καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσι.*

(2) Rev. x. 5: *ὤμοσεν ἐν τῷ ζῶντι.* So Theod. (Dan. xii. 7); but LXX., *ὤμοσε τὸν ζῶντα.*

(3) Rev. xii. 7: *Μιχαὴλ . . . τοῦ πολεμῆσαι.* Theod. has also *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* (Dan. x. 20); but LXX., *διαμάχεσθαι* without *τοῦ.*

(4) Rev. xiii. 7: *πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων.* So Theod. (Dan. vii. 21); but LXX., *πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους.*

(5) Rev. xix. 6: *φωνὴ ὄχλου.* So Theod. (Dan. x. 6); but LXX., *φωνὴ θορύβου.*

(6) Rev. xx. 4, and Dan. vii. 9. Apoc. and Theod. have *κρῖμα*: LXX., *κρίσις.*

(7) Rev. xx. 11: *τόπος οὐκ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς.* So Theod. (Dan. ii. 35); but LXX., *ὥστε μηδὲν καταλειφθῆναι ἐξ αὐτῶν.*

If the first or the last of these examples had been found in Hermas, instead of in the Apocalypse, it would certainly have been regarded as affording positive proof that Hermas used Theodotion. In the present case it may be said that St. John was not under the necessity of using any version, and could have translated for himself from the Chaldee. And so, no doubt, he could. And yet, I think nothing but a strong

preconceived opinion that St. John could have used no other version than the Chisian would prevent the conclusion from being drawn that he actually does use a different version. The author of the Apocalypse did not write Greek with such facility that he should scorn to use the help of a Greek translation; and in fact, in the case of other books of Scripture, he shows himself acquainted with the Greek Bible.

If no other version than the Chisian was accessible to St. John, we need not be surprised at his rejecting it and preferring to render for himself, because such a course would certainly be adopted by any Jew who was able to read the original, and who at all valued faithfulness of translation. But is it intrinsically probable that for centuries every Jew competent to ascertain the fact kept to himself his knowledge of the unfaithfulness of the current version; and that none had the charity to make a better version for the use of his Greek-speaking brethren? On the other hand, is it very improbable that such a version, if made, should now only live for us in its successors, as Tyndale's translation lives for us in the Authorized English version?

I think that some of the coincidences noted above, between St. John and Theodotion, especially the *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* of No. (3) are more than accidental; but that St. John used a translation of some kind appears more clearly from the very numerous passages where Theodotion and the Chisian agree, and St. John agrees with both—a thing not likely to happen so often if he was translating independently. But if St. John used a translation, that translation was not the Chisian, with which he gives no clear sign of agreement. I find instances which may induce us to think that the version employed by St. John was not identical with Theodotion's, but scarcely anything to show that it was the Septuagint. I only notice two cases where, on a comparison of the Apocalypse with the so-called LXX. and Theodotion, the advantage seems to be on the side of the LXX. These passages are:—

(1) Rev. i. 14: *ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡς ἔριον λευκόν, ὡς χιών, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς φλὸξ πυρὸς καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ.* Dan. vii. 9 (LXX.), *ἔχων*

περιβολὴν ὡσεὶ χιόνα καὶ τὸ τρίχωμα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκὸν καθαρόν· (Theod.), τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡσεὶ χιών, καὶ ἡ θριξ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔριον καθαρόν. Dan. x. 6 (LXX.), οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ λαμπάδες πυρὸς . . . καὶ οἱ πόδες ὡσεὶ χαλκὸς ἐξαστράπτων· (Theod.), οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ λαμπάδες πυρὸς . . . καὶ τὰ σκέλη ὡς ὅρασις χαλκοῦ στίλβοντος.

(2) Rev. xix. 16, βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κύριος κυρίων. So LXX. (Dan. iv. 31), Θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων, to which there is nothing corresponding in Chaldee or Theodotion. The former example proves, if proof were necessary, that St. John was not dependent on Theodotion's version; but does not prove that he used the LXX. I do not know that any stronger proof of that can be given than whatever the latter example may be thought to afford.

Dr. Gwynn has also examined the use made of Daniel in other N. T. books, and still with the result that that use cannot be accounted for on the supposition that the N. T. writers used only the Septuagint version of Daniel. For example, the words κατασκηνοῦν and ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις, which occur Matt. xiii. 32, are found in Theodotion's version of Dan. iv. 9; but not in the LXX., which instead of κατεσκήνουν has ἐνόσσευον.

So in Matt. xiii. 43, Dan. xii. 3, the ἐκλάμψουσιν agrees with the λάμψουσιν of Theodotion against the φανοῦσιν of the LXX.; and in Matt. xxiv. 21, Dan. xii. 21, Matthew and Theodotion agree in θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν, where LXX. has ἡμέρα θλίψεως οἵα οὐ ἐγενήθη.

In Mark xiv. 62, as also in Rev. i. 7, the Son of Man is spoken of as coming *with* (μετά) not *on* (ἐπί) the clouds; in this agreeing with Theodotion's text against the Chisian. A more doubtful case of coincidence is James i. 12, which is closer to Theodotion's version of Dan. xii. 12 than to the LXX.

Again, Clement of Rome (*c.* 34) quotes Dan. viii. 10: 'Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, and thousand thousands ministered unto him;' and for 'ministered' he has Theodotion's word ἐλειτούργουν, not the LXX. ἐθεράπευον.

Further, the Apocryphal Book of Baruch contains several verses taken from Dan. ix.; Baruch i. 15–18, being nearly

identical with Dan. ix. 7–10, and Baruch ii. 11–16, with Dan. ix. 15–18. A few critics bring down this book (or the Greek of it, if we are to receive it as a translation from a Hebrew original) as late as the reign of Vespasian, and none brings it later; but the great majority regard it as pre-Christian. Now, on comparing the passages, Baruch is found to be considerably nearer Theodotion than the LXX. Thus:—

Bar. i. 15; ii. 11, . .	ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη. So Theod.
But LXX., ...	κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην.
Bar. i. 16 and Theod.,	τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν.
LXX., ...	τοῖς δυνάσταις ἡμῶν.
Bar. i. 18 and Theod.,	πορεύεσθαι . . . οἷς ἔδωκε κατὰ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν.
LXX., ...	κατακολουθῆσαι . . . ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν.
Bar. ii. 11 and Theod.,	ὃς ἐξήγαγες τὸν λαόν σου.
LXX., ...	ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν τὸν λαόν σου.
Bar. ii. 14 and Theod.,	εἰσάκουσον κύριε.
LXX., ...	ἐπάκουσον δέσποτα.
Bar. ii. 16 and Theod.,	κλῖνον τὸ οὖς σου.
LXX., ...	πρόσχες, instead of κλῖνον.

The instances adduced not only clearly prove all I want to establish, namely, that coincidences with Theodotion's version do not prove that a document is not as early as the first century; but they seem to point distinctly to the existence at least in that century, and probably much earlier, of a version of the Book of Daniel having closer affinities with Theodotion's than with the LXX.

The passage in Hermas then simply takes its place as one of many proofs of that fact. I have given these proofs at greater length than was at all necessary for my immediate purpose, on account of the interest I felt in Dr. Gwynn's investigations, which throw light on a subject that has been very little studied: that of the history of first-century Greek translations of the Old Testament. Enough has been said to show that if it can be established on other grounds that the Book of Hermas belongs to the early part of the second century, no reason for rejecting that date is afforded by the fact

that we find in the book a verse of Daniel quoted in a form for which the Hexaplar Septuagint will not account.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.—It would evidently be impossible for me to keep within reasonable limits if I were to attempt to speak of all the remains of early Christian antiquity which present interesting subjects for discussion. I have therefore taken as my guide the list of works whose claims to be included in the public use of the Church Eusebius thought it worth while to take into consideration when making his list of canonical books (*H. E.* iii. 25). Of the books there mentioned there remains but one which I have not yet noticed. In company with the Epistle of Barnabas, Eusebius names 'what are called the Teachings of the Apostles' (τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί). I have already (see p. 581) referred to the list of canonical books given some years later by Athanasius, in his 39th Festal Epistle; and there you find, excluded from the books of Scripture, but joined with the Shepherd of Hermas, as useful for employment in catechetical instruction, 'what is called the Teaching of the Apostles' (Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων): you will observe that the singular number is used. The Διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων is also included in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (see p. 178). It is found there in an appendix giving a list of apocryphal books of the New Testament, viz. the Travels of Peter, of John, of Thomas, the Gospel of Thomas: then follows the Didaché, and then books to which the name 'apocryphal' can only be applied in the sense that they have no claim to possess the authority of Scripture, viz., the Epistles of Clement, of Ignatius, of Polycarp, and the Shepherd. In this list the length of the Διδαχή is given as 200 στίχοι,* by which we see that it was a short book, since in the same list the Apocalypse of St. John is said to contain 1400 στίχοι.

Until very recently we could only form a vague judgment that the work known to Athanasius and Eusebius must have been the nucleus round which gathered the institutions which form the extant eight books of *Apostolic Constitutions*. It is

* Harnack calculates that the Didaché published by Bryennius would make 300 στίχοι.

now agreed that this work, in its present form, is not earlier than the middle of the fourth century; and in recent times much has been done to trace the history of the growth of the collection. The subject is too wide a one for me to attempt to enter into it; but it is necessary to mention an ancient tract, the foundation of Egyptian Ecclesiastical Law, first published in Greek from a Vienna MS. by Bickell (*Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, 1843), but extant also in Coptic, Æthiopic, Syriac, and Arabic. Bickell called it *Apostolische Kirchenordnung;* and, in order to distinguish it from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which, in their present form, are certainly a later work, I shall refer to this under the name of the 'Church Ordinances.' Its title in the Greek MS. is αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων. It may be divided into two parts; in the first each of the Apostles is introduced as giving a piece of moral instruction; in the second part the Apostles in like manner severally give directions about ordinations and other Church rites. I may mention that the number of twelve Apostles is made out in a singular way. Cephas is made an Apostle distinct from Peter: he and Nathanael take the place of James the Less and Matthias. Paul is not mentioned at all. Now, when this tract is compared with the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the latter is found to begin with a large expansion of the moral instruction contained in the first part of the former; and the conclusion suggests itself that this tract was one of the sources employed by the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Further, this moral instruction begins with what we may regard as a commentary on Jer. xxi. 8, 'Behold I set before you the way of life and the way of death,' words which may themselves be connected with Deut. xxx. 15, 'See, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil.' The 'Church Ordinances' set forth in detail the characteristics of these 'Two Ways.' One sentence of this exposition is quoted by Clement of Alexandria as Scripture (*Strom.* i. 20, p. 377), whether he got it in the 'Church Ordinances' themselves, or in an earlier document, from which they borrowed, 'My son, be not a liar; for lying leads to theft.'

The use of an earlier document is made probable by our finding elsewhere this teaching about the 'Two Ways.' The Epistle of Barnabas consists of two parts. The first part, which contains the doctrinal teaching, is brought formally to a close in ch. 17, and then the writer abruptly says, Let us now pass to another doctrine and teaching (γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχήν). And then he proceeds to give the teaching of the 'Two Ways,' presenting numerous coincidences with the corresponding section in the 'Church Ordinances.' Now, a curious fact is, that this second section of Barnabas is not extant in the ancient Latin translation; whence suspicion has arisen as to the genuineness of this portion of the Epistle. But any hesitation as to accepting the testimony of the Greek text is removed by the fact that passages from this section are expressely quoted as from Barnabas by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 18, p. 471), and by Origen (*De Princ.* III. ii. 4). And it may be added, as bearing on the question presently to be considered, whether Barnabas was original in this part of his teaching, that Origen, at least, appears to consider him so, quoting him as the authority for the teaching concerning the 'Two Ways.' The probable explanation of the omission of this section by the Latin translator is, that he left it out because the West was already in possession of the teaching concerning the 'Two Ways' in another form. Evidence of the existence of such a form is found in the commentary on the Creed by Rufinus, written towards the end of the fourth century. He gives (*cc.* 37, 38) a list of canonical and ecclesiastical books, founded on that of Athanasius; but whereas Athanasius couples the Didaché with the Shepherd, Rufinus has in the corresponding place, 'libellus qui dicitur Pastoris, sive Hermas; qui appellatur Duæ viæ, vel Judicium Petri.' Now, it is to be observed, that whereas Eusebius (iii. 3), enumerating the apocryphal books bearing the name of the Apostle Peter, gives the titles of four works—the Acts, the Gospel, the Preaching, and the Revelation of Peter—Jerome in his *Catalogue* adds a fifth, the Judgment of Peter. We cannot but think that the works mentioned by Rufinus and Jerome are the same; and the second title, the 'Two Ways,' leads us to think that it must

have contained the same matter as is found in the second part of Barnabas, and in the 'Church Ordinances,' only that instead of this teaching being, as in the latter book, distributed among the Apostles, it was apparently, in the Western book, put into the mouth of Peter.

The facts of which I have given a summary were discussed in an able Paper by a Roman Catholic divine, Krawutzcky, in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1882, who drew from them the following inferences: that, as early as the second century, the section in Barnabas which treated of the 'Two Ways' was expanded and formed into a separate tract; that it came into Church use, and was the work cited as Scripture by Clement of Alexandria; that, to give greater weight to the teaching, it was put into the mouth of Peter; that this work was made use of by the compiler of the 'Church Ordinances,' who made the alteration of distributing the teaching among the twelve Apostles; that the compiler of the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, without any acquaintance with the 'Church Ordinances,' made independent use of the 'Two Ways;' so that by comparison of the 'Constitutions' and 'Ordinances,' a restoration of the earlier work which furnished a common element to both might be obtained.

Within two years scholars found reason to think that it was quite true that the 'Constitutions' and 'Ordinances' had a common source, but that there was no need of conjectural restoration in order to recover it. I have related (p. 578) the discovery by Bryennius at Constantinople of a complete copy of Clement's Epistles. The same volume contained other Ecclesiastical writings, and in particular a complete Greek text of Barnabas. The attention of the discoverer seems at first to have been quite absorbed by the use to be made of his volume in restoring the text of previously known documents; and though he published his edition of Clement in 1875, it was not till the close of 1883 that he gave to the world a previously unpublished work contained in the same volume. This bears the heading 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), and commences, 'Teaching of the Lord by the twelve Apostles to the Gentiles.' It then goes on to give the

teaching of the 'Two Ways,' which occupies the first half of the tract. Then follows a second part, giving directions first about baptism, then about Eucharistic formulæ, then about Church teachers, and in conclusion there is an eschatological passage treating of the Second Coming of our Lord. This work bears every mark of very great antiquity; and it has been commonly accepted as belonging to the beginning of the second century, if not to the latter part of the first. And it has been generally recognized as the work known to Eusebius and Athanasius, and as the common source of 'Ordinances' and 'Constitutions.' Krawutzcky, however, resists the temptation to regard the Didaché as the fulfilment of his critical anticipations. He maintains that the result of a comparison of the 'Ordinances' and the Didaché is not that the one book borrows from the other, but that both have employed a common source. And he holds that the Didaché displays Ebionite tendencies, and was probably not written before the close of the second century. And it is quite true that there is much in the book that not only a Roman Catholic, as Krawutzcky is, might naturally dislike to accept as orthodox teaching, but with which even a member of our own Church cannot feel satisfied.

I do not count among reasonable causes of offence that the book displays great immaturity of Church organization, but rather accept this as a proof of the great antiquity of the document. In that part which treats of Church teachers the foremost place is given to Apostles and Prophets. But the word 'Apostle' has not the limited meaning to which modern usage restricts it. The 'Apostles' are wandering missionaries or envoys of the Churches. Directions are given as to the respect to be paid to an Apostle, and the entertainment to be afforded him by a Church through which he might pass; but it is assumed that he does not contemplate making a permanent stay. On the contrary, if he demands lodging for more than two nights, or if on leaving he asks from his entertainers a larger supply than will suffice to carry him to his next lodging, he shows that he is no true prophet. Now, the word ἀπόστολος was in Jewish use applied to

messengers sent by the rulers at Jerusalem with letters to Jewish communities elsewhere;* it is used in the New Testament of envoys or commissioned messengers of the Churches (2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25); but those are called in a special sense Apostles who derived their commission not from men, but from Jesus Christ. Hermas, also (*Sim.* ix. 15), appears to use the word in a wide sense, representing the building of the Church as effected by forty 'apostles and teachers,' and these as not holding the foremost place in the work. The use of the word, therefore, in the Didaché affords no cause of offence, but attests the antiquity of the document. The chief place in the instruction of the local Church is assigned to the 'prophets,' whose utterances were to be received with the respect due to their divine inspiration, and who were entitled to receive from their congregations such dues as the Jews had been wont to render to the high priests. The possibility is contemplated that in the Church there might be no prophet. In that case the first-fruits are to be given to the poor. Mention is also made of teachers, by which I understand persons who gave public instruction in the Church, but who did not speak 'in the spirit,' as the prophets did. The place assigned to the prophets corresponds very well with the state of things which I infer from Hermas, but with this notable difference, that in Hermas the prophets appear to be subordinate to the presbyters. Here, on the contrary, the first mention is only of apostles and prophets; then directions are given for Sunday Eucharistic celebration, and then is added 'elect, *therefore*,† to yourselves bishops and deacons.' These, we are told, are to be honoured with the prophets and teachers,

* See references in Lightfoot (*Galatians*, p. 92).

† The Didache fails to give any confirmation to the theory put forward by Dr. Hatch in his 'Bampton Lectures,' that bishops and deacons were primarily appointed for the administration of the Church funds. Knowing that such administration was one of the bishop's functions in the time of Justin Martyr, we are rather surprised to find no mention in the Didaché that gifts intended for the poor passed through the hands of the bishops or deacons. Whatever may be meant by 'the gifts' in Clem. Rom., *ch.* 44, the function there ascribed to the presbyters is that of offering, not of administering them; and the displaced Corinthian presbyters are commended, not for the integrity with which they had discharged the latter office, but for the meekness with which they had 'borne their faculties' in the former.

as fulfilling like ministration. The inference then suggests itself that at the time this document was written the Eucharist was only consecrated by the president of the Church assembly, who held a permanent office, and who, probably, might also be a preacher; but that in the mind of the writer the inspired givers of public instruction held the higher place. No mention is made of the necessity of obedience to any central authority at Jerusalem, Rome, or elsewhere. Whether the state of ecclesiastical organization here indicated agree or not with what we may think likely to have existed in Apostolic times, and whether we accept the author as a witness to the general practice of the Church in his time, or only as to that which prevailed in his own locality, or according to his own notions of fitness, still there is no reason for setting him down as a heretic, and the unlikeness of his account to the constitution which we know became general before the second century was far advanced, may be taken as proof of the writer's antiquity.

I find much more cause of offence in the Eucharistic prayers which are given (*cc.* 9, 10). In the first place, we are surprised to find information given as to the most sacred mysteries of the religion in a document clearly intended for the instruction of catechumens. It is free to us, no doubt, to suppose that in that early age no reserve was practised; but Athanasius recommended that the book known to him as the Didaché should be employed in catechetical instruction. Would he use it for such a purpose if it revealed what only 'the faithful know'? These Eucharistic prayers themselves contain no mention of our Lord's institution of the rite, and no mention of His Body and Blood. And through the whole document I find no unequivocal proof that the writer really believed in our Lord's Divinity, or that he looked on Him as more than a divinely commissioned teacher. Krawutzcky remarks that the writer is silent as to the doctrines of the Incarnation and Redemption and of the sending of the Holy Ghost. Still, if he was an Ebionite, he belonged to the better sort of them; he is certainly no Elkesaite. He gives directions for the blessing of the Cup; but in the ascetic sect from which the pseudo-Clementines emanated, wine does not

seem to have been employed, even in Eucharistic celebration.

In deciding as to the date of the Didaché, a crucial question is the determination of its relation to Barnabas and Hermas. In the case of Barnabas the obligations on the one side or the other are too extensive to admit of dispute. The parallel passages of Barnabas occupy four pages in Bryennius's edition. Bryennius himself entertains no doubt that the Didaché was indebted both to Barnabas and Hermas, and this view is also taken by Hilgenfeld, Harnack, and Krawutzcky. But Zahn and other good critics hold the opposite opinion; and they advance arguments which seem to me to prove decisively that in that part of the Didaché which treats of the 'Two Ways' there is no obligation to Barnabas. The precepts in the Didaché are systematically arranged, following the order of the Decalogue, on which they serve as a commentary; in Barnabas they are quite promiscuous. It is not a probable hypothesis that the author of the Didaché went through Barnabas, picking out the moral precepts, and that he succeeded in arranging his excerpts into a symmetrical whole. Yet if I am right in referring Barnabas to the decade A. D. 70–80, if the Didaché was so much older, and had so much authority as to be thought worth pillaging by Barnabas, its claims to be really an Apostolic document deserve serious consideration; and how are we to explain the very limited circulation which this truly Apostolic teaching obtained, so that it has had the very narrowest escape of perishing altogether?

In solving this difficulty I have found the greatest assistance from a study of the Didaché in connexion with the Talmud, by Dr. Taylor.* It results from his investigations that the Didaché is an intensely Jewish document, and that its contents are so well accounted for by the use of Jewish sources, that we lose all temptation to imagine that the author had need to resort to Barnabas for guidance. But Dr. Taylor's

* *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with Illustrations from the Talmud*, by C. Taylor, D.D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. See also the *Expositor*, 3rd Series (1866), III. 316, 401. I am unable to notice other more recent Papers by Dr. Taylor and others, not having given any study to the Didaché since the publication of the last edition of this book.

illustrations did more than bring me to his conclusion that the author of the Didaché had received a Jewish training; they seemed to me to make it probable that the 'Two Ways' is a pre-Christian work: in other words, that the author of the Didaché has taken a Jewish manual of instruction for proselytes, and has adapted it for Christian use by additions of his own; in particular by insertions from the Sermon on the Mount. This hypothesis would account for the heading, Teaching of the Twelve Apostles *to the Gentiles*. It has been remarked by several that there is nothing in the work which suggests that it is intended for exclusively Gentile use; nay, that as I have intimated before, it does not even seem adapted for the use of catechumens, Jews, or Gentiles. But the title would be accounted for if the original of the document were a manual of instruction for Gentile proselytes to Judaism. There was at least sufficient inducement to take this as a working hypothesis, and see how it would bear examination. For there is a test which can be applied to it, namely, to examine whether Barnabas knew the Didaché in its present Christianized form. If he did, Barnabas was so early that it is unreasonable to assume that there was an earlier form. On the other hand, if Barnabas knew, not the Didaché, but the supposed Jewish parent of the Didaché, it is likely that when he adapted it to the use of his Christian disciples, the Jewish element in the work would no doubt remain the same as in the Didaché; but that the additions of specially New Testament teaching would, except for some chance coincidences, be different. Now, when we look at the four pages in Bryennius which contain Barnabas's adaptation of the 'Two Ways,' we find that he has not Christianized it at all. There is no use of the Gospels, no mention of Jesus Christ, not a word that might not have been written before our Lord was born. I do not know how it will appear to others, but to my mind it comes with the force of demonstration, Barnabas never saw the Didaché. I find it impossible to believe that if he knew that work he would have gone over it, adapting it to his use by carefully erasing every line which contained anything of specially Christian teaching, or which implied a knowledge of oral or

written Gospels. Traces of such knowledge may be found in other parts of the Epistle of Barnabas, but not in this section. The supposition that the Didaché had a Jewish original becomes thus something more than a mere hypothesis: it is a conclusion forced on us if we believe that Barnabas did not use the Didaché, and that the Didaché did not use Barnabas. The difference of order in the two documents is at once explained. The author of the Didaché wrote with the Jewish original before him, and systematically followed its order; Barnabas, merely in giving practical exhortation, interwove, as his memory furnished them, precepts from a manual with which he had formerly been familiar.* And if he did not reproduce very accurately either the language or the order of the document he used, this, as Dr. Taylor has remarked, ought not to surprise anyone who considers how Barnabas deals with the Old Testament.

If we admit that the Didaché is but a Christianized form of an originally Jewish book, the question whether the writer who gave the work its present form knew Barnabas assumes a different aspect. For, besides the section on the 'Two Ways,' common to both books, there is one clear coincidence between the early part of Barnabas and the last chapter of the Didaché, an entirely Christian chapter, which treats of the Second Coming of our Lord. If I am right in supposing that Barnabas did not know the Didaché in its present form, the obligation cannot be on his side. On the other hand, all the marks of superior antiquity that have been found in the Didaché belong to the Jewish element in the book, so that there is no reason for denying an acquaintance with Barnabas on the part of the writer who contributed the Christian element. There is a difficult phrase in this last chapter, which, if we could only be sure that we interpret it rightly, would afford a more direct proof of the dependence of that chapter on Barnabas. It gives as the first of three signs of

* This introduces a new element for the determination of the question (p. 569), whether or not the so-called Barnabas was a Jew. I now suspect that he had been a Gentile proselyte to Judaism, and had thus become acquainted with the 'Two Ways.'

our Lord's immediate coming, *σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ*. I think Archdeacon Edwin Palmer has given the best explanation of this. He refers to the words of Isaiah (lxv. 2), 'I have stretched forth (*ἐξεπέτασα*) my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.' Barnabas interprets this of our Lord's 'stretching forth' His hands on the cross; and Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 35; *Trypho* 197) and several other fathers follow him in giving this mystical meaning to the verb *ἐκπετάννυμι*. If we could count the author of the Didaché in the number of these followers, his phrase is at once explained as meaning the sign of the cross. If this explanation be right, the relative order of Barnabas and this part of the Didaché is determined. If Barnabas came first, the phrase in the Didaché is explained; but if the Didaché came first, a phrase so obscure would never suggest to Barnabas his interpretation of Isaiah, and without that interpretation we should be at a loss to know how the phrase came to be adopted.

The coincidences between the Didaché and Hermas are much fewer than in the case of Barnabas, and there is even room for dispute whether there is literary obligation on either side. I myself did not regard the coincidences as accidental; but, believing Hermas to be later than Barnabas, I did not care to give the matter much examination, it being likely enough that the Jewish document which was used by Barnabas would be known also to Hermas, and used by him. Further consideration, however, has led me to give a different explanation of the coincidences in question. The most important are to be found in the first chapter of the Didaché, a chapter in which large use is made of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Now, Gebhardt has brought to light a short Latin fragment, containing the commencement of the *Teaching of the Apostles;* and in this there is no trace of the 'Sermon on the Mount' section. That this is no accidental omission is proved by a passage in Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* vi. 3), where he delivers the doctrine of the 'Two Ways' in a form agreeing with the Latin fragment in all the points in which that differs from Bryennius's Didaché, so as to leave no doubt that the fragment truly represents the form in which the

Teaching circulated in the West.* Neither is any trace of the 'Sermon on the Mount' section found in writings ascribed to Athanasius which appear to use the Didaché; and it has been already stated that the length set down for the Didaché in a stichometry favours the opinion that the work intended was a shorter one than that published by Bryennius.

While, then, I hold to the opinion that the original nucleus of the Didaché was pre-Christian, I am led to the further conclusion that Bryennius's form is not that even in which the Didaché first appeared as a Christian document. On examining the coincidences with Hermas which are to be found in the 'Sermon on the Mount' section, which there is reason to regard as belonging to the latest part of the document, the priority seems to me to be clearly on the side of Hermas; and therefore I consider that, though the earliest Christian form of the Didaché is probably earlier than Hermas, the section in question was added by one who had read Hermas. He who added this section may well have added more; and I am inclined to believe that the other places where coincidences with Hermas occur are also not original. The earliest proof of acquaintance with the Didaché in its present form is to be found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, compiled after the middle of the fourth century, which exhibit a clear use of Bryennius's Didaché. The document which I have called the *Church Ordinances* is clearly later than Barnabas, but antecedent to Bryennius's form. I do not venture to say whether the compiler used the Didaché in its Jewish or in its early Christian form.

The theory, then, about the Didaché which most commends itself to me is that it had for its original a form used by Jews for the instruction of proselytes: that this form continued to be used in the Palestinian Churches, with some slight additions and alterations, giving it a more Christian aspect; that the document (being intended, not for literary circulation,

* There is one Western quotation from *Doctrinæ Apostolorum* (pseudo-Cyprian, *De Aleatoribus*, p. 96, Hartel). It has affinities with a passage in Bryennius's Didaché, but differs a good deal in form. Harnack has lately ascribed the authorship of this tract *De Aleatoribus* to Victor of Rome; but for reasons which I cannot state here at length, I count it impossible that it can be quite so early.

but for practical use) received additions from time to time; and that when it came to be known outside the Churches of Jewish descent, it circulated first in its shorter, afterwards in a longer, form. I do not believe that the work at any time had extensive influence or circulation. The testimonies exhibiting knowledge of the existence of a book of 'Apostolical Teaching' appear to me to be really few. I do not find, for example, in the extant works of Irenæus* or Tertullian, evidence of knowledge of the existence of such a book. Clement of Alexandria might have brought a copy from Palestine to Egypt; but this I take to have been in the shorter form, which alone is heard of until the time of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

If the view I have taken be correct, that the Didaché, as we know it, was a work of very limited circulation and influence, which spread but little and slowly outside the purely Jewish section of the Church, it ceases to be of much importance in the history of the Christian Church; and any inferences we draw from it are affected by the uncertainty whether certain portions of the book, as we now have it, belong to the earliest form. But, on the other hand, the book gains in importance when regarded as a contribution to the history of Judaism, exhibiting the religious training which had been received by pious Jews before the Gospel was preached to them. I therefore turn back to examine how much of the Didaché can be supposed to have been based on a previously existing Jewish manual. To that manual we naturally refer the first five chapters containing the 'Two Ways.' The sixth is a short chapter, giving license to the disciple, in matters of food, not to bear the whole yoke if he is not able, but insisting on his at least abstaining from things offered in sacrifice to idols. Nothing forbids us to think that this was a rule of life prescribed by Jews to a proselyte, and

* There is, I think, reasonable ground to infer knowledge of the Didaché from one of the mysterious fragments, as from Irenæus, published by Pfaff from a Turin Catena, which has since disappeared. I see no reason to doubt, that Pfaff found the extracts ascribed to Irenæus in the MS. which he copied; but Catenae often make mistakes in their ascription of authorship, and though I believe the extract in question to have been from the work of an ancient author, I do not believe that that author was Irenæus. Zahn's remark is conclusive, that this fragment quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's.

the whole chapter may have been found textually in the original manual.

The seventh chapter treats of baptism. The candidate is previously to have been taught all the preceding instructions; then he is to be baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The baptism is to take place in preference in running water; if this cannot be had, in standing water; if cold water cannot be had, it may take place in warm water; by which we are apparently to understand that if neither river nor pond were accessible, the baptism might take place in drawn water, such as that of a bath. If water in sufficient quantity could not be had, water might be thrice poured on the head in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Both baptizer and baptized were to fast previously, and, if possible, others with them; but in any case the person to be baptized must fast beforehand one day or two. It is evident this chapter has been Christianized; but the original document could hardly have failed to contain in the corresponding place instructions about baptism, which was a ceremony considered essential in the admission of proselytes. The doctrine of the absolute necessity of the preliminary fast receives a curious illustration from the pseudo-Clementines. In the part of that romance (*Recog.* vii. 36; *Hom.* xiii. 11) which relates the baptism of Clement's mother, Peter directs that she must fast one day previously. She declares that she has eaten nothing for the last two days (a fact to which Peter's wife bears witness), and asks to be baptized at once. Peter smiles, and explains that a fast made without reference to baptism will not count. She must fast all that day; they will all fast with her, and then she can be baptized the next day.

The next chapter in the original in all probability treated of fasting and prayer. The Didaché here directs the disciple to fast twice a-week; but not on Mondays and Thursdays, like the hypocrites, but on Wednesdays and Fridays; and to pray three times a-day; but instead of praying like the hypocrites, to use the Lord's Prayer, which is given with the doxology. It appears to me that the adapter here designedly departed from his original; and that the rules of fasting and the prayers which he calls of 'the hypocrites,' were those

which he found in his original, and for which he substitutes purely Christian equivalents. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 16) speaks of the Monday and Thursday fast as a Pharisaic institution. The author of the Didaché had, no doubt, in his mind our Lord's words, which occur so often in Matt. xxiii., 'Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!'

The ninth and tenth chapters of the Didaché are generally understood as referring to the Eucharist. I have already intimated some difficulty as to this view, and the difficulty is increased by the fact that the Eucharist is treated of in a later chapter (14). Why should it be treated of twice? I believe the answer to be, that in the corresponding place of the original Jewish manual the proselyte was taught as the concluding piece of his instruction forms of benediction to be used before and after solemn meals. These forms, I take it, the compiler of the Didaché adapted for Christian use, leaving it free, however, to persons endowed with prophetical gifts to use different forms if they chose. These forms might be used in the Christian Love Feasts; but I do not believe that the Eucharist proper is treated of before the fourteenth chapter. And, in fact, if I am right in my inference from the 'therefore' at the beginning of chap. xv., the Didaché agrees with Justin Martyr in making consecration the office of the president of the assembly, and there could be no reason why formulæ for the purpose should be taught to the ordinary disciple. It is true that the word εὐχαριστία is here used in the Didaché, and it is ordained that no unbaptized person shall eat of it. Yet I am disposed to believe the explanation to be, that the word Eucharist had not yet come to be used exclusively of the Lord's Supper. In the Clementines great prominence is given to Peter's benediction of meals in cases, where if an administration of the Eucharist, as we understand the word, be intended, Peter must have made every meal a Eucharist. For example, Clement, narrating his intercourse with Peter, previous to his baptism, says:—'And when he had said these things, and had taken food, he by himself, he commanded that I also should take food, and he blessed over the food, and gave thanks after he was satisfied,* and exhorted me

* Compare μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι (*Didaché*, ch. x.).

with a word concerning that [which he had done]; and after these things he said, God grant thee that thou mayest in everything be like unto me, and mayest be baptized, and this same food with me thou mayest receive.'*

I do not know whether the influence of a Jewish original can be traced beyond chap. x.; and yet it is quite possible that a Jewish manual might contain directions as to the reception of ἀπόστολοι, there being Jewish officers so called, as has been already remarked. And if the manual had contained orders as to the payment of first-fruits for the support of the high-priests, we could understand why the Didaché, in directing that first-fruits should be paid to the prophets, should add, 'for they are *your* high-priests.' At any rate, chaps. xiv., xv., and the last chapter, on our Lord's Second Coming, are not likely to have had anything corresponding in a merely Jewish book. But there is one passage about which a few words must be said. I have said that in the section of Barnabas on the 'Two Ways' there is no use of the Gospels; but there is one passage which apparently exhibits a use of the Acts and of St. Paul. Barnabas says (ch. xix.): 'Participate with your neighbour in all things, and say not that things are your own; for if you have been participators in that which is incorruptible, how much more in corruptible things.' The passage strongly recalls Rom. xv. 27, and 1 Cor. ix. 11. But the same words are found both in the Didaché and in the 'Church Ordinances,' save that instead of ἀφθάρτῳ we have ἀθανάτῳ. If we could take the three as independent witnesses, it would follow that there must have been corresponding words in the Jewish original; and then the question would arise whether that original may

* Clem. *Recog.* i. 19, translated for me from the Syriac by Dr. Gwynn. The strongest evidence that Clement of Alexandria knew the Palestinian form of the Didaché is, that he uses (*Quis dives salvus*, 20) the phrase 'vine of David,' which occurs in one of these benedictory prayers. The phrase itself we may well believe occurred in the Jewish benediction, and there meant the Jewish people. And it is possible that this benediction may have been copied into the Egyptian form of the 'Apostolic Teaching.' It is generally owned that the latter part of the 'Church Ordinances,' as we have them, is a later addition; but in order to make room for that addition, the 'Way of Death,' and possibly some other portions of the original document, have been cut away. Bornemann notices (*Theol. Literaturz.* 1885, 413) that Origen also has 'veræ vitis quæ ascendit de radice David' (*In Librum Judicum*, Hom. 6, xi. 258, Lommatzsch).

not have been old enough to have been known to St. Paul. But as there is also what looks like a use of Acts iv. 32, the passage can scarcely be pre-Christian; and I am therefore disposed to believe that Barnabas is here the original. I have already come to the conclusion that the Christian adapter of the Didaché had seen Barnabas, and he may have made an addition from that source. I have not made any systematic study of the 'Church Ordinances;' but I share the general belief that the latter half is not of the same date as the earlier portion;* and the later compiler may have been acquainted with the Didaché. Some fuller account of the early use of the Didaché, and of the literature to which its discovery by Bryennius has given rise, will be found in an article ('Teaching of the Twelve Apostles') which I contributed to Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

* There is in the latter one very curious passage (§ 26), indicating jealousy of the women on the part of the Apostles, which I suspect owes its origin to something in the Gospel according to the Egyptians. At least, the same feature shows itself in the Gnostic work, *Pistis Sophia*, which is also Egyptian. In p. 57, when Mary, who has already been highly commended by the Saviour for her previous answer, is about to speak, Peter leaps forward, and says: 'Lord, we cannot suffer this woman to take place with us, for she will not allow any of us to speak, but is speaking very often;' and again, p. 161, Mary says: 'I would answer, but I am afraid of Peter, who is threatening me, and who hates our sex.'

INDEX TO PERSONS AND SUBJECTS.

Abbot, Ezra, Dr., 62, 72, 75, 78, 85.
Abbott, Edwin A., Dr., on fourth Gospel, 78; on Encratism, 81; on Synoptic Gospels, 143, 147–151; on 2 Peter, 545–559.
Abgar legend, 201, 354–7, 522.
Abraham, 480, 559.
Acts of the Apostles: see Contents, Lecture XVIII.
Adams, Professor, 273.
Addai, 83, 354, 372, 374.
Adulteress, pericope of, 97, 166.
Ænon, 278.
African Church; its language, 45; its version of Scripture, 159.
Africanus, 577.
Agrippa, 375.
Alexander, Syriarch, 360.
Alexandria, 42, 73, 167, 230, 465, 571, 572, 602.
Alexandrian MS.: see *Codex* A.
Alexandrians, Epistle to, 50, 456, 570.
Alford, Dean, 132, 140, 343.
Alogi, 229.
Ambrose, 38, 357, 567.
Amen, the Christian, 369.
Ammonius, harmony of, 83, 86.
Amphilochius, 520.
Ἀναγέννησις, 74, 310, 557.
Ἀνάλυσις, 439.
Anastasius Sinaita, 272.
Anatolius, 527.
Ancyra, 410, 412.
Andrew, Acts of, 372, 378.
Anencletus, 575.
Anger, 109, 184.
Anicetus, 268.
Anne, mother of Virgin, 193.
Ἀνομία, 21.
Antitheses of Marcion, 204.
Apelles, Gnostic, 177.
Apocalypse of John, 88, 219, 223, 526; rejected by Caius, 53; its use of our Lord's words, 221; its use of Daniel, 604 *sqq.*; see Contents, Lectures III., XII., XIII., XIV.
—— *of Peter*, 225, 560–4, 573.
—— *of Baruch*, 226.
—— *of Paul*, 564.
Apocalyptic prediction, 400.
Apocrypha, Jewish, 525, 563.
Apocryphal Gospels, 35, 119, 165, Lecture XI.
——— *Acts*, Lecture XIX.
Apollinaris of Hierapolis, 271, 272.
——— of Laodicea, 320, 526.
Apollonius, 365.
Apollos, 74, 465, 469.
Apologies, do not quote N.T., 44.
Apostle, name not limited to the Twelve, 291, 405, 613, 624; name pre-eminently given to Paul, 404; as title of our Lord, 454.
Apostles, false, 31.
Apostolic Church Ordinances, 610 *sqq.*

Apostolic Constitutions, 368, 527, 577, 609 *sqq*.
Aquila and Priscilla, 499.
Aquila, translator O.T., 595–599.
Arabia, 71.
Aramaic, 117, 141, 154, 165, 174.
Archippus, 417, 418.
'Αρετή, 547, 555.
Aringhi, 377.
Aristarchus, 396, 417, 448.
Aristion, 91, 103, 288.
Arnold, 245.
Arnold, Matthew, 62.
Artemon, 56.
Artlessness of Synoptics, 311.
Ascension of our Lord; believed by early Church, 163; recognized in fourth Gospel, 300, 311; in the Apocalypse, 311; previous relation of, known to St. John, 313.
Asceticism, 202, 282.
Assumption B. V. M., 384, 386.
——— *of Moses*, 526.
Athanasius, 272, 456, 520, 533, 581, 609, 622.
——— *Pseudo-*, 293, 526.
Athenagoras, 79.
Athens, Paul's speech at, 342.
Augustine, 38, 111, 126, 154, 178, 212, 357, 365, 383, 458, 517, 526, 527, 564.
Autoptic touches in St. Mark, 153, 154; in fourth Gospel, 286.

Babooism, 545, 546, 552.
Babylon, the name how used, 481, 482.
Baethgen, 84.
Balaam, alleged nickname for St. Paul, 27.
Baptism, precept of, not directly mentioned by St. John, 310; St. John and Justin, 74; female, 357; lay, 360; Gnostic administration of, 368; rules for, in the Didaché, 611, 622.
Baptism of our Lord, 175, 180.
Barcochba, 281, 518.
Bardenhewer, 600.
Barnabas, 330, 332, 334, 457, 458; his claim to authorship of Epistle to the Hebrews, 465–471.
——— *Epistle of*, 107, 404, 457, 493, 535, 560, 565–572; and the Didaché, 611 *sqq*. Whether the author was a Jew, 569, 618.
Bar Salibi, 84, 86, 228.
Bartholomew, 167.
Baruch, Book of, 606.
——— Apocalypse of, 226.
Basil, 414, 530.
Basilides, 58, 61, 104, 435, 477, 532.
Baur, 13; his Canon, 23, 123, 212, 218, 220, 221, 263, 294, 321, 330, 341; on Mark, 154; on the Acts, 294, 403; on Paschal disputes, 263, 267–270; on Pauline Epistles, 387, 397, 415, 419, 425, 434.
Baur's theory of early Church History, Lect. II., 330–6, 341, 373, 387, 462, 480, 489, 507.
Beast, of Apocalypse, 26, 224, 253 *sqq*.
Beasts, four, 38.
——— miracles on, in Gnostic Acts, 370, 380.
Bede, 515.
Bel and the Dragon, 179, 516, 603.
Benary, 246.
Bentley, 5, 7, 163.
Beræa, 168.
Bickell, 607.
Birthplace of our Lord, 297.
Bishops and Deacons, 415, 613.
Blastus, 272.
Boanerges, 79, 93.
Bonnet, 352.
Borghesi, 64.
Bornemann, 624.
Borrowing, literary, 133, 259, 542.
Boycotting, 252.

Brandes, 564.
Brethren of our Lord, 195, 522.
Brindley, 427.
Bruce, 527.
Bryennius, 578, 609, 612–621.
Bugs, story of, 380.
Bunsen, 50, 558, 564.
Bunyan, 583.
Burgon, Dean, 87, 158.
Byrrhus, 383.
Byzantium, 378.

Caiaphas, 277, 281.
Caius, of Rome, 51–57, 227–229, 339, 377, 456, 484.
Caius, of 3rd John, 293.
Caligula, 253, 482.
Calvin, 253, 453, 460, 531.
Canon, how formed, 120–127, 192, 516–518, 529, 530, 541, 566, 597, 577.
Carpocrates, 524.
Carthage, Council of, 459, 541.
Caspari, 274.
Cassiodorus, 493, 532, 534.
Catacombs, 377.
Catholic Church, 20, 428–431.
——— *Epistles*, 492, 578.
Cave, our Lord's birth in a, 71, 194.
Celtic characteristics, 412.
Celsus, 158.
Cephas, 300, 610.
Ceriani, 226, 526.
Cerinthus, 27, 227–229.
Chagigah, 265.
Chase, 251.
Cherubim and the Gospels, 38.
Chigi Version of Daniel, 597, *sqq*.
Chiliasm, 225–231.
Christology, of fourth Gospel, 215; of Synoptic Gospels, 217; of Apocalypse, 219–223, 235, 433; of St. Paul, 221, 420, 433; of St. James, 512.
Chrysostom, 264, 357, 443, 530.
Church (see *Catholic*).
Church Ordinances, 610, *sqq*.
Ciasca, 86.
Circuits of Peter, 372.
Circumcision, a title of honour with St. Paul, 30, 569; short duration of controversy concerning, 403.
Claudia, 450.
Clement, of the Epistle to the Philippians, 345, 575.
Clement of Alexandria, 41, 81, 167, 177, 560.
——— his notices of the Gospels, 93, 110, 264, 483, 497.
——— of other parts of N. T. 212, 339, 454, 478, 493, 519.
——— of uncanonical writings, 177, 196, 201, 365, 373, 526, 527, 560, 565, 573, 579, 600, 610, 624.
——— of heretical writings, 41, 61, 203, 371, 421, 477, 532.
Clement, Irenæus, and *Tertullian*, 35, 211, 317, 390, 401, 423, 477.
Clement of Rome, 572–9, 20, 32, 88, 106, 318, 336, 391, 404, 423, 434, 443, 449, 453, 459, 476, 477, 485, 495, 538, 556, 563, 592, 607, 614.
——— his second Epistle, so-called, 578, 203, 423, 433, 538.
Clementines, Pseudo-, 14–19, 76, 77, 373–375, 80, 174, 365, 468, 480, 496, 518, 527, 536, 616, 622; their N. T. quotations, 176, 177.
Codex ℵ, 70, 108, 159, 305, 310, 414, 533, 563, 565, 581.
—— A, 556, 563, 573, 578.
—— B, 70, 159–161, 305, 316, 317, 414, 459, 533.
—— C, 224, 316.
—— D, 323.
—— L, 163.
—— *Amiatinus*, 383.
—— *Augiensis*, 474.
—— *Aureus*, 383.
—— *Barocc.anus*, 319.

Codex Cheltoniensis, 559.
—— *Chisianus*, 597.
—— *Claromontanus*, 473, 533, 559, 563, 581.
Coincidences, John and Synoptics, 312.
———— John and Paul, 433.
———— Acts and Epistles, 342, 347, 490.
———— Peter and Paul, 486.
———— Peter and James, 489.
———— Peter and John, 236.
———— Luke and Josephus, 350, 351.
———— 2 Peter and Josephus, 547–556.
—— — N. T. and Philo, 557, 558.
———— St. John and Theodotion, 603–606.
———— Barnabas and Didaché, 618.
Colossians, 221, 416–423.
Commentary, earliest N. T., 61.
Conflation, 140, 600.
Constantine, 161, 378.
Contradictions between fourth Gospel and Synoptics, 296; do not disprove early date, 265.
Controversies, dying out of, 428–429.
Conybeare, 389.
Cook, Canon, 161, 345.
Corinth, Church of, 392, 572.
Corinthians, Epistles to, 409.
Corrections of N. T. text in third century, 56.
Cotterill, Mr., 556.
Cross, foretold in Isaiah, 619; Gnostic cult of, 380.
Cross-references in Acts, 325.
Crown of Life, 221, 501.
Cumming, Dr., 250.
Cureton, 84, 158–9, 189.
Cyprian, 158, 377, 534, 559, 600.
———— Pseudo, 373, 620.
Cyprus, 347, 467.
Cyrenius, 70.
Cyril of Alexandria, 158, 515.
—— *of Jerusalem*, 158, 367, 533.
Cythnos, 244.

Damasus, 378, 522.
Daniel, 218, 400, 594–606.
Dante, 369.
Darwin, 442.
Dathan and Abiram, 576.
David, Son of, 219.
Davidson, Dr., **7**, **237**, 210, 238, 248, 317, 320, 326, 329, 335, 342, 387, 398, 399, 415, 417, 421, 425, 429, 439, 445, 453, 534, 544.
Dead, Prayers for, 360.
De Boor, 319.
Decretal Epistles, 7, 280.
Demas, 358, 417, 448.
Demetrius, 295.
De Morgan, Professor, 273.
Derenbourg, 502.
De Rossi, 378.
Derry, Bishop of, 209, 415.
Des Cartes, 82.
Development of Doctrine, 422, 511.
De Wette, 297, 329, 425.
Diatessaron, 80, 82–87, 357.
Dictionary, Christian Biography, 48, 52, 62, 200, 590, 625.
Didaché, 291, 514, 608–625.
Didymus, 520, 526, 532.
Dillmann, 527.
Diodorus, 87.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 25, **224–235**, 288, 476.
———— *of Corinth*, 85, 225, 318, 391, 484, 572–573.
———— *Bar Salibi*, 84, 86, 228.
Diotrephes, 291–293.
Discourses of our Lord, unique, 113.
Dismas and Gestas, 201.
Dispersion, 277, 498.
Divinity of our Lord, taught by St. John, 215–222; asserted by Himself, 216, 308.

Docetism, 195, 197, 282, 283, 293, 363, 370, 379.
Doddridge, Dr., 586.
'*Domine quo vadis*,' 376.
Domitian, 215, 243, 255.
Donaldson, 582.
Dressel, 76.
Drummond, 74, 78.
Ducange, 368.
Duchesne, 377.

Easter Controversies, 266–272.
Ebed Jesu, 530.
Ebionites, 14, 76, 616; meaning of word, 173, 502; two kinds, 18; their Gospel, 169, 172; their rejection of Paul, 16; their Acts, 372; opposed by St. John, 382.
Edersheim, 264.
Edessa, 16, 82, 354, 364, 372.
Edinburgh Review, 245, 249.
Egyptians, Gospel according to, 41, 202, 203, 625.
Eichhorn, 146.
Eleutherus, 422.
Elkesai, 19, 173, 332, 372, 422, 614.
Ellicott, Bishop, 389.
Encratism, 81, 202–204, 354, 358, 361, 362, 371, 380, 435.
Enoch, 520, 527, 528.
Eothen, 324.
Epaphras, 417.
Epaphroditus, 345, 415.
Ephesians, Epistle to, 59, 403, 414, 423–433, 564.
Ephesus, 26, 31, 73, 232, 241, 338, 384, 418, 440, 444, 499.
Ephraem Syrus, 83–86, 228, 231, 290, 477, 496, 520.
'Επίγνωσις, 439.
'Επιούσιος, 144, 181.
Epiphanius, **168**, 16, 148, 172–176, 195, 196, 200, 205, 228, 229, 248, 357, 383, 522, 532, 564, 572, 597–599, 623.
'Επιφάνεια, 439.
Episcopacy, 293, 415, 430, 449, 572, 575, 591.
Epistemon, 253.
Erasmus, 453, 531.
Esdras, Book of, 603.
Essenes, 18.
Eucharist, institution of, 346; not recorded by St. John, 297, 306; Christian belief in, 309, 615, 623; evidential value of, 309, 310; Gnostic rites, 369.
Eusebius, his principle of selection of testimonies to the Canonical Scriptures, 51, 89.
——— whether an argument can be founded on his silence, 89, 95.
——— his classification of books, 228, 475, 495, 529, 562, 572, 578, 609.
——— his discovery of 'John the Elder,' 288.
——— For authors quoted by him, see under their respective names.
Evodius, 526.
Ewald, 445.
'Εξέραμα, 530.
'Εξοδος, 536, 554.
Eznig, 477.
Ezra, 603.

Fabricius, 352, 373.
Farrar, Archdeacon, 245–249, 252, 254, 389, 548–555.
Fasting, 622.
Feasts, Jewish, in fourth Gospel, 276.
Firmilian, 421, 534.
FitzGerald, Bishop, 69, 175, 253, 345, 549.
Florinus, 37.
Forgery, 58, 291, 388, 427, 540.
Four Beasts, 38.
Friend of God, 495.

Fritzsche, 226, 246, 526.
Furneaux, 5.

Gaius : see *Caius*.
Galatians, Epistle to, 16, 23, 334, 345, 403–413, 510.
Galen, 83, 351.
Galilee, 151, 152, 188, 278, 279.
Gamaliel, 326, 374.
Gardiner, Col., 586.
Garrett, Mr., 528.
Gebhardt, 91, 619.
Gelasius, Pope, 522.
——— of Cyzicus, 526.
Genealogies omitted by Tatian, 83.
Gentiles, their admission into the Church, 334, 428, 429, 617.
Georgius Hamartolus, 319.
Gieseler, 212.
Glaucias, 532.
Gnosis, 435, 566.
Gnosticism, date of commencement, 420–423; two types of, 362, 524; use of St. John's Gospel, 79; the claim to possess secret traditions, 268; their ritual, 367; cult of cross, 380; Acts, 353, 363; and miracles, 380; tale about Hades, 477; story of death of Zacharias, 196.
Gobar, *Stephen*, 457.
Godet, 155, 254.
Gospels, why four, 37, 38; meaning of word, 123; 'according to,' 109; lost Gospel, 67; genesis of, 128–130; their publication prehistoric, 122; order of publication, 41, 110; fifth Gospel, 178 (see *Apocryphal*).
Grabe, 373.
Grapte, 587.
Greek, the language of Early Roman Church, 45, 55; whether spoken in Holy Land, 187; of New Testament, 239, 508, 546, 606.
Gregory the Great, 378.
Gregory, Nazianzen, 357.
——— *Nyssen*, 195, 357.
Grotius, 398, 539.
Gundephorus, 365.
Gutschmid, 362, 365.
Gwynn, Dr., 53, 228, 305, 349, 415, 439, 538, 549–557; 597–606, 624.

Hades, 200, 356, 477, 478.
Hadrian, 281, 319, 421, 518, 571.
Hapax legomena, 543, 550, 555.
Harmony of Gospels, 82–86, 103.
Harnack, 85, 91, 105, 255, 319, 468, 559, 601, 609, 616, 620.
Harris, *Rendel*, 563, 594.
Hatch, Dr., 614.
Hausrath, 445.
Hebrew, alleged original language of St. Matthew, 92, 93, 141, 165–190; words preserved by St. Mark only, 70.
Hebrews, Gospel according to, Lect. x., 165–190.
——— Epistle to, Lect. xxi., **453–473**, 51, 88, 344, 508, 540, 558, 580, 595.
Hegesippus, 50, 87, 186, 421, 422, 434, 497, 503, 521, 525, 573, 574.
Helena, Empress, 356.
——— harlot, 374.
Hell, harrowing of: see *Hades*.
Hemphill, 86.
Heracleon, 61, 82, 371, 373.
Heretic, 437.
Heretical testimony to Gospels, 58.
——— Gospels, 202–208.
Hermas, **579–606**, 49, 52, 89, 113, 318, 433, 458, 476, 478, 494, 538, 562, 565, 609, 611, 616, 620.
Hermathena, 52, 53, 601.
Hermogenes, 358.
Herodotus, 368, 419.
Heumann, 254.

Hilgenfeld, **70**, 77, 102, 107, 108, 179, 186, 192, 196, 221, 304, 350, 373, 387, 393, 399, 415, 427, 453, 488, 526, 534, 564, 623.
Hippocrates, 351.
Hippolytus, **57–63**, **590**, 79, 160, 199, 201, 203, 228, 229, 230, 264, 272, 273, 374, 376, 432, 457, 496, 537, 564, 600.
Hitzig, 246.
Hobart, Dr., 143, 351.
Hobbes, 301.
Holsten, 396, 595.
Holtzmann, 350, 426, 427, 486.
Holy Ghost, the name feminine in Aramaic, 179.
Hone, 191.
Hooykaas, Dr., 295, 321, 322.
Hope, Apostle of, 491.
Hort, Dr., 46, 62, 64, 158, 164, 414, 467, 544, 594, 600.
Hospitality of Christians, 282.
Howson, Dean, 389.
Hug, 212, 497.
Hugo, Victor, 247, 434.
Hystaspes, 373.

Iconium, 349, 358, 411.
Iconoclasts, 379.
Ignatius, 20, 106, 185, 186, 308, 318, 391, 401, 423, 572, 574, 609.
Inaccuracy of quotations, 69, 133.
Infancy of our Lord, 67.
Inspiration of Scripture, 2, 3, 37, 55, 126, 517, 528, 567.
Irenæus, **36–40**, 49, 55, 65, 79, 80, 89, 92, 99, 105, 110, 158, 167, 199, 202, 224, 231, 243, 248, 254, 268, 288, 290, 369, 374, 395, 432, 457, 478, 527, 536, 567, 574, 575, 598, 599, 621.
Irenæus, Clement, and *Tertullian*, 35, 211, 317, 401, 416, 423, 434, 477.
Irish Revisers C. P., 75.
Irony of St. John, 302.

James, the Lord's Brother, 178, 346, 497, 501, 511, 521.
——— *Epistle of*, Lect. XXIII.
——————— and Shepherd of Hermas, 593.
——— *Gospel of*, 119, 193–196.
James, grandson of Jude, 521.
Jason, 396.
Jeremiah, Pseudo-, 478.
Jerome, 38, 54, 86, 126, 168, 171, 177–186, 196, 228, 290, 340, 354, 360, 369, 381, 382, 393, 403, 435, 458, 492, 517, 520, 522, 523, 529–531, 534, 543–545, 566, 573.
——— *Pseudo-*, 354, 532.
Jerusalem, how often visited by our Lord, 314–316; its Church, 422; its bishop, 497, 523; Apostles ordered not to leave, 365.
Jesus Justus, 417.
Jewish Christians fraternized with unconverted brethren, 269, 569.
Jewish hostility to Christians, 31, 519.
Jews, the phrase, 23, 277, 397, 569.
——— its use by St. Paul, 30.
Joachim, 193.
John the Baptist, 208, 285, 300, 374.
John the Apostle, character of, 27; not mentioned in fourth Gospel, 62, 289; whether visited Asia, 290; whether visited Rome, 255, 294; knew of other Gospels, 266, 300–306; story of his death, 318, 383; his two tombs, 384; John and the Robber, 379; John and Peter, 213, 294.
John, Gospel according to: see Lects. XII.–XVII., 569.
——— *the First Epistle*, 209–212, 544.
——— *the Second and Third Epistles*, 290–295, 353.
——— *Acts of*, 378–384.
John the Elder, 91, 231, 232, 287–290.

John Mark, 232.
Jortin, 192.
Josephus, 141, 187, 189, 246, 264, 267, 275, 277, 280, 350, 351, 481, 482, 498, 536, 547–556, 561.
Judas Iscariot, 313, 316, 319.
——— *Thomas*, 355, 364–372, 522.
Jude, Epistle of, Lect. XXIV.
Judith, 305.
Julian, Emperor, 515.
——— the Pelagian, 178.
Julius Africanus, 577.
June 29, 376.
Junilius, 530.
Justin Martyr, **64–80**, 16, 93, 102, 110, 119, 155–159, 196, 199, 200, 201, 224, 258, 281, 309, 311, 369, 373, 374, 392–395, 401, 416, 422, 434, 454, 478, 498, 514, 518, 527, 535, 537, 600, 623.
Justus Barsabas, 318, 382.
Juvenal, 93, 514.

Καύσων, 498.
Keble, 231, 567.
Keim, 184, 290, 480.
Kerioth, 316.
Kihn, 530.
Klostermann, 155.
Κοίμησις, 384.
Κόφινοι, 312.
Krawitzcky, 612–616.
Krenkel, 351.
Kyria, 294.

Lachmann, 164.
Lactantius, 373, 619.
Lamb, as title of our Lord, 235, 256.
Laodicea, Paschal disputes at, 271, 272.
——— Council of, 541.
Laodiceans, Epistle to, 205, 402, 403, 414, 418.
Latin Translation N. T., 42, 44–47.
Laud, Archbishop, 253.
Laurence, Archbishop, 527.
Lazarus, raising of, 315.
Leathes, Dr. Stanley, 238.
Lee, Archdeacon, 220.
—— Bishop, 181.
Lekebusch, 342.
Leucius Charinus, 248, 363, 378–383, 386.
Leusden, 543.
Lewin, Mr., 389.
Lias, 222.
Lightfoot, 10, 389.
——— *Commentaries*, 18, 90, 293, 403, 421, 427, 522, 589, 614.
——— *Contemporary Review*, 9, 84, 88, 90, 102, 103, 105, 108, 211, 319, 348.
——— *Ignatius*, 186, 478, 480.
——— *Other writings*, 97, 181, 318, 414, 485, 565, 589, 590.
Linus, 449, 575.
Lipsius, **352**, 36, 148, 184, 200, 229, 357, 378, 386, 468, 482, 560, 589.
Liturgical use of Gospels, 94.
Liturgy of Rome, 45, 575.
Livia, 375.
Logia of St. Matthew, 95–103.
Logos, 43, 72, 73, 80, 81, 207, 235, 284, 309, 420.
Loman, 387.
Longinus, 69.
——— soldier, 201.
Lost Gospel, 67.
—— *Epistles*, 402.
Lots, drawn by Apostles, 364.
Lucian, 461, 556.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 520, 525.
Luke, his literary skill, 327; his medical knowledge, 143; his principles of selection, 338; Luke and Philip, 338–340; Luke and Josephus, 350; his means of information, 340, 341; shows no knowledge of Paul's Epistles, 344–347; not named in MSS. as author of Acts, 322.

Luke's Gospel, not anti-Jewish, 22; whether known to Papias, 101.
Lumby, Dr., 542, 545, 558.
Luther, 249, 453, 460, 465, 506.
Lycus, 417.
Lydia, 344, 415.
Lyons: see *Vienne*.

Macarius Magnes, 163, 477, 561.
Macedonian Churches, foundation of, 405.
M'Clellan, Mr., 264, 273.
Mahaffy, Professor, 82, 133, 419.
Mahomet, 253.
Mai, 181.
Maitland, 588.
Malchion, 519.
Manaimus, 319.
Manasses, Prayer of, 576.
Manichæans, 363, 364.
Man of Sin, 399, 401.
Marcion, 16, 19, 46, 60, 80, 204–208, 318, 390, 401, 403, 414, 423, 457, 570, 598.
Marcus, heretic, 369; *Marcosians*, 600.
Mark's Gospel, not an abridgment of Matthew's, 154; said to have been composed at Rome, 163; its relation to Peter, 70, 92, 93, 109, 153, 483; its Aramaic words, 70, 154; its supposed original, 95; closest of the Synoptics to its original, 148; its autoptic touches, 153, 154; tradition as to its composition, 110, 483; its accuracy asserted by Papias, 100.
——— Last twelve verses of, 156–164.
Marsh, Bishop, 146.
Martial, 450.
Martin of Tours, 8.
Martyrdom of Paul, 336, 377; of Peter, 484; of other Apostles, 371.
Mary Magdalene, 313.
Massoretic text, 55.
Massuet, 46.
Matthew, Pseudo-, 197.
Matthew's Gospel, not anti-Pauline, 22; independent of Luke's, 139; its supposed original, 95; whether written in Hebrew, Lect. x.
Matthias, 41, 476.
Mayerhoff, 426.
Melito of Sardis, 271–273, 371, 386.
——— *Pseudo-*, 354.
Memoriter quotations, 69, 107.
Menander, heretic, 366, 375.
Methodius, 357, 393, 561.
Meyer, 140.
Michael, Archangel, 525.
Michaelis, 146.
Milan, 48, 468.
Miletus, 342.
Millennarianism, 226–231.
Minucius Felix, 537.
Miracles, 5–13, 79, 149, 328, 354.
Missions, Apostolic, differ from modern, 124.
Mixed Chalice, 369.
Moesinger, 85.
Mommsen, 377 559.
Money-changers, be ye good, 18, 177, 185, 388.
Montanism, 51, 52, 79, 231, 457, 579, 590–593.
Morality, Christian, 513–515.
Moses, Assumption of, 526.
——— Law of, 204, 403, 429, 504–507, 569.
Muratorian Fragment, **48–55**, **590**, 211, 225, 317, 336, 338, 381, 401–403, 423, 434, 443, 456, 478, 496, 519, 534, 560, 579–582, 589–591.
Murphy, Mr. J. J., 222.

Nazarenes, 173, 176.
Neander, 421, 601.
Nepos, 231.
Nero, 243–255, 261, 375, 443.
Neubauer, 188.

Nicaea, Council of, 191, 192.
——— *Second Council of*, 379.
Nicephorus, 178, 199, 355, 363, 526, 555–557, 563, 573, 609.
Nicholson, 177, 186.
Nicodemus, 75, 298, 311.
———— *Gospel of*, 119, 200, 356.
Nicolaus, 27.
Noeldechen, 601.
Nolte, 319.

Oil, 367, 382.
Old Testament, Gnostic opposition to, 282.
Olshausen, 548.
Omissions of fourth Gospel, 62, 297–316.
Onesimus, 417.
Onesiphorus, 358, 437, 450.
Ophites, 433.
Origen, 49, 60, 173, 179, 181, 182, 186, 196, 197, 199, 230, 290, 319, 364, 373, 378, 414, 455, 464, 493, 519, 522, 525, 533, 537, 566, 575, 579, 587, 599, 603, 611, 624.
Otho, 571.
Otto, 371, 394.
Overbeck, 329, 599, 600.

Palestine, known to fourth Evangelist, 278; language of, 187.
Paley, 18, 48, 388, 425, 462.
Palmer, Archdeacon, 619.
Pamphilus, 168.
Pantænus, 41, 167, 187, 454.
Papias, 62, 80, 87–105, 109, 117, 121, 153, 158, 165, 170, 187, 190, 211, 214, 224, 225, 288, 318, 339, 382, 477, 483.
Papylus, 90.
Parallel between Peter and Paul, 335.
Parnell, 252.
Parthia, 245.
Parthians, Epistle to, 212.
Paschal Chronicle, 90, 264, 271, 272, 598.
——— *Controversies*, 266–273.
Passion, date of, 200, 273.
Passover, whether eaten at Last Supper, 263–265, 273–275.
Pastor, 580.
Pastoral Epistles, 205, 359, 433–452, 576.
Patara, 393.
Paul, his personal appearance, 359; report of his speeches in the Acts, 342–344, 440; whether released from Roman imprisonment, 410; observed Jewish institutions, 269; martyrdom, day of, 377; Apocalypse of, 564; Paul and Simon Magus, 15–19, 373; and John, 222; and Peter, 335, 575; and Barnabas, 466, 568.
Paul of Nisibis, 530.
Pauline Epistles, 33, 387–452, 578; whether known to Luke, 344–347.
Paulinism of Apocalypse, 26–32, 222, 223; of Peter, 480.
Paulinists and anti-Paulinists: see *Baur's* theory.
Paulus, 10, 149.
Pearce, Bishop, 69.
Peregrinus, 461, 556.
Perpetua, 45.
Peshitto, 158, 228, 290, 456, 499, 520, 528, 530.
Petavius, 597.
Peter of Alexandria, 195.
Peter the Apostle, his character, 481; his speeches reported in the Acts, 347, 545; his Roman Episcopate, 15; his martyrdom, 294; 377, 484; Peter and Mark, 93, 152, 153, 483; and Paul, 335, 575; legends of, 622, 625.
—— *The First Epistle*, 92, Lect. XXII.

Peter the Apostle, The Second Epistle, 28, 389, 390, 478, Lect. XXV.
—— *Gospel according to*, 195, 476, 522, 562.
—— *Acts of*, 372–378, 562.
—— *Apocalypse of*, 225, 493, 560–564.
—— *Judgment of*, 611.
—— *Preaching of*, 19, 186, 365, 373, 562.
Pfaff, 621.
Pfleiderer, 223, 415, 445, 480.
Pharisees, in Acts, 230, 325.
Philaster, 148, 228, 369.
Philemon, 221, 417, 426.
Philip, 298, 318, 338–340, 371.
——— *Acts of*, 372.
Philip of Side, 319, 521.
Philippi, 269, 349.
Philippians, Epistle to, 415.
Phillips, Dr., 83, 356.
Philo, 73, 99, 264, 481, 495, 536, 538; his influence on N. T. Greek, 552–558.
Philoxenus, 528.
Photius, **363**, 178, 369, 394, 457, 493, 534, 556, 573.
Phrynichus, 143.
Picture of our Lord, 356.
——— of Apostle John, 379.
Pilate, Acts of, 119, 200.
Pistis Sophia, 381, 563, 625.
Pitra, 394.
Pius I. of Rome, 49, 580, 582, 589.
Pliny, 348, 349, 479, 514.
Plumptre, 264, 464.
Pococke, 528.
Poison, 318, 382.
Polemo, 362.
Polycarp, 20, 31, 36, 39, 79, 106, 211, **268**, 290, 318, 391, 401, 424, 434, 454, 477, 574, 609.
Polycarpus, 528.
Polycrates, 272, 339, 572.
Porphyry, 7, 163, 203, 231.
Pothinus, 36.
Preaching Christ, 112, 115.
Proclus, 339.
Proconsuls, 347.
Prophecy, interpretation of, 250.
Prophet, False, of Revelation, 26, 246–248, 252.
Protevangelium, 193–196, 522.
Protonice, 356.
Prudentius, 376, 567.
Pudens, 450.
Purists, 239.
Pusey, 597.

Quadratus, 319.
Quarry, Dr., 82, 485, 537, 549.
Quartodecimans, 79, 262–273.
Quotations, O. T., 69, 145, 544.

Rahab, 508.
Ramathaim, 316.
Raphael, 194.
Reeves, Bishop, 357.
Regeneration, 74, 310, 557.
Renan, 8, 24, 27, 77, 79, 96, 97, 100, 109, 113, 125, 153, 184, 189, 198, 200, 212, 218, 235, 243–245, 252, 275, 278, 294, 297–303, 305, 306, 311, 316, 317, 328, 359, 387, 412, 413, 415, 417, 423, 424, 433, 443, 452, 503, 523.
Resurrection, 33, 326, 358, 393.
Reuss, 137, 246, 415, 441.
Revelation: see *Apocalypse*.
Rhoda, 583, 585.
Roberts, 188.
Romans, Epistle to, 407–410; its conclusion, 48, 304, 413; its use in Hebrews, 463; in 1 Peter, 486; whether in James, 509.
Rome, Church of, 572–577, 590–593.
Rönsch, 42.
Routh, 91, 104, 320, 549, 577.
Royal Law, 494.
Rufinus, 15, 372, 493, 537, 611.
Rushbrooke, 147, 148.
Rusticus, 64.

Sabatier, 257–262.
Sacrifices and Elkesaites, 18, 20, 174.
Sadducees, 325, 502.
Sadler, Mr., 67, 130.
Sagaris, 271.
Salome, 194, 203.
Samaria, 375.
Sanday, Dr., 69, 206, 264, 275, 277, 281, 549.
Satan, 439.
Saturninus, 202.
Sauppe, 419.
Sayings of our Lord, 202.
Schenkel, 415, 524.
Schleiermacher, 95, 138, 184.
Schisms, healing of, 20; in Apostolic times, 292.
Scholten, 108, 141, 211, 290, 295, 387.
Schöttgen, 535.
Scriptures, the word how used, 37.
Seal, 360, 367, 369.
Second Coming, 210, 249, 400, 613, 619.
Secundus, 349.
Self-assertion of Jesus, 215, 307.
Septuagint, 145, 275, 463, 525, 530, 594–608.
Serapion, 195.
Sergius Paulus, 347.
Sermon on the Mount, 66, 138, 619.
Sethites, 477.
Seufert, 488, 489.
Seven Churches, Epistles to, 26–31, 225, 507.
Sibyl, 244, 373, 537.
Silas, 322.
Silence of tradition as to publication of Gospels, 122; of Apocryphal Gospels, as to our Lord's public life, 119, 185; of St. John, 297, 310; of fourth Gospel, as to St. John, 62, 289; of Acts as to Paul's Epistles, 344; as to martyrdom of Peter and Paul, 317, 336; of Eusebius, 88, 95.
Simon Magus, 15, 16, 246, 335, 363 372–376.
——— *of Cyrene*, 154.
Sinaitic MS.: see Codex ℵ.
Sixtus of Rome, 377.
Σκάφη, 368.
Smith, of Jordan Hill, 6, 132.
Socinians, 215.
Solecisms of Apocalypse, 238.
Solomon, Psalms of, 563.
Sophocles, 301.
Sophronius, 183.
Soter of Rome, 268, 573.
Sozomen, 562, 564.
Speaker's Commentary, 209, 220, 255, 264, 345, 389, 415, 439, 542, 545.
Stanley, Dean, 278.
Stichometry, 178, 199, 363, 473, 559, 563, 565, 609, 620.
Stobæus, 419.
Stoicism, 342, 494, 538.
Stone, J., 432.
Strabo, 347.
Strauss, 9, 10, 35, 39, 76, 100, 184, 214, 306.
Suetonius, 244.
Sulpicius Severus, 8.
Supernatural Religion, 9, 40, 77, 88, 206, 350.
Supplemental character of fourth Gospel, 306.
Susanna, 604.
Swete, 493.
Symeon of Jerusalem, 497, 522, 539.
Symmachus, 495, 596, 599.
Syncellus, 527.
Synoptic Gospels, 112, 217, 308, 311; Lects. VIII., IX.
Synopticon, Rushbrooke's, 147, 148.
Syria, 499, 503.
Syriac versions, 248, 477, 528, 573, 578: see *Peshitto*.

Tacitus, 5, 244, 450.

Talmud, 196, 264, 569, 616.
Tarsus, 342, 564.
Tatian, 79–86, 371, 435, 537.
Taylor, Jeremy, 75.
——— Dr. C., 616.
Teaching of Twelve Apostles, 291, 405, 514, 581, 611–625.
Temeluchus, 561, 565.
Tendency School, 13, 204.
Tennyson, 105, 238, 240.
Terence, 64, 301.
Tertullian, 42–47, 60, 158, 196, 200, 201, 205, 211, 317, 357, 381, 382, 457, 465, 467, 484, 496, 519, 527, 534, 546, 566, 580, 601, 621 : see *Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian.*
——— *Pseudo-*, 148, 229.
Tertius, 401.
Tetrapla, 597.
Thaddæus, 201, 354–357, 522.
Thamyris, 358.
Tharshish, 602.
Thebaic Version, 459.
Thecla, 349, 357–364, 382, 541.
Thegri, 594.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 178, 403, 530.
Theodoret, 79, 83, 158, 530.
Theodotion, 594–608.
Theophilus of Antioch, 62, 77, 79, 87, 88, 126, 228, 417, 434, 537.
Theophylact, 248, 421.
Thessalonians, Epistles to, 395–402.
Thessalonica, 349.
Thiel, 522.
Thilo, 352.
Thirlwall, 9, 301.
Thoma, 72, 78, 81, 393.
Thomas, Apostle, 355, 371, 386.
——— *Gospel of*, 197–199, 476.
——— *Acts of*, 363–372.
Thucydides, 133.
Tiberius, 356.
Tillemont, 384.
Timothy, 321, 322, 359, 461 : see *Pastoral Epistles.*
Tischendorf, 119, 159, 200, 305, 352, 375, 378, 384, 386, 565, 597.
Titus, 322, 449 : see *Pastoral Epistles.*
Tradition, Triple, 147–153.
——— silence of, 122.
Trajan, 253, 290, 422, 480, 489, 521.
Travelling Memoranda, 341.
Tregelles, 48, 163, 305.
Trent, Council of, 577, 604.
Trogyllium, 324.
Trophimus, 437.
Tryphæna, 360.
Turibius, 367.
Two Ways, 610, 625.
Tychicus, 417, 418, 425.
Tyndale, 606.

Unleavened Bread, 269.
Ur-Markus, 95, 119.
Ussher, 414, 600.

Valentinus, 58–61, 79, 431, 432, 567.
Valerian, Emperor, 377.
Variations of independent translators, 117, 142; of Evangelists, 133.
Various readings, argument from, 42, 56, 70, 205.
Vatican, 377.
——— *Council*, 50, 384.
——— *Manuscript* : see *Codex* B.
Vegetarianism, 203.
Velleius Paterculus, 4.
Veronica, 201.
Versions, use of, 57 ; old Latin, 477, 601.
Vespasian, 246, 252, 570, 608.
Victor of Capua, 82, 85.
——— *of Rome*, 272, 572, 620.
Vienne and Lyons, 36, 252, 317, 434, 477, 536, 574.
Virgin, marriage of, 194 ; assumption of, 384–386.

Virginity of Mary, 193, 196; of John, 381, 385.
Vischer, 255–262.
Vocabulary, changes in, 419, 439, 546.
Volkmar, 26, 184, 206, 246, 373, 527.

Wace, Dr., 85.
Warfield, 549.
'*We*' *sections* of Acts, 320–328, 341.
Weisse, 445.
Weizsäcker, 184, 480.
Westcott, *N. T. Canon*, 9, 48, 62, 68, 69, 99, 178, 224, 393, 475, 478, 534, 568.
——— *Gospels*, 176, 186, 202, 264, 273.
——— *St. John*, 209, 241, 255, 275, 277.
Westcott, *other Writings*, 158, 178, 522, 544.
Wetstein, 536.
Whately, Archbishop, 74.
Wieseler, 264, 273, 274.
Wisdom, description of, Prov. viii., 43, 73.
——— Book of, 464.
Wordsworth, Bishop, 463.
Works, *Good*, 507.
Wright, W., 352, 384.
Wurm, 273.

Xenophon, 419.

Zacharias, death of, 194, 195.
Zahn, 44–47, 81, 84, 186, 205, 378–383, 390, 391–395, 401.
Zeller, 220, 221, 329.
Zephyrinus, 51, 590.
Zocer, 521.

INDEX TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE CITED.

I.—OLD TESTAMENT.

	PAGE
GENESIS iv. 15	99
vi. 1	527
xiv. 14	566
xv. 6	98
xvii. 27	566
xviii. 17	495
xxii. 7	302
Exodus iii. 14	240
xii. 6	267
46	263
xxiv. 8	308
Num. ix. 12	263
xi. 8	175
Deut. x. 9	99
xi. 14	498
xviii. 22	250
xxi. 23	490
xxviii. 25	498
xxx. 4	498
15	610
Joshua x. 20	397
xv. 25	316
2 Samuel xii. 3	302
2 Chron. xii. 12	397
xx. 7	495
xxxi. 1	397
xxxvi. 22, 23	604
Ezra i. 1	604
Nehemiah i. 1	233
9	498

	PAGE
Psalms i. 1	565
iv. 5	424
viii. 6	463
xxii. 6	477
xxiii. 4	478
xxxiv. 20	263
xl. 6	464
xli. 9	275
lxxxvi. 13	478
lxxxix. 20	318
xc. 4	535
cxviii. 22	347, 488
cxl. 3	228
cxliii. 2	408
cxlvi. 2	498
Proverbs iii. 34	489
viii. 12, &c.	43
x. 12	489
xxvi. 11	530
Isaiah i. 1	234
3	197
ii. 1	234
16	603
vi. 1	234
9, 10	275
viii. 14	485
xi. 2	182
10	219
xxviii. 16	485, 488
xxxiv. 4	538, 562

	PAGE
Isaiah xli. 8	495
xlii. 8, 12	555
xliii. 21	555
xlix. 17	571
lii. 15	355
liv. 5	432
lxi. 2	314
10	432
lxv. 2	619
Jer. iii. 14	432
xv. 4, 10	179
xxi. 8	610
xxxiii. 9	554
xl. 9	554
Ezekiel i. 6	38
viii. 3	179
xvi. 13	179
xvii. 10	497
xviii. —	202
7	182
xxxiv. 2	525
Daniel i. 2	603
6	234
ii. 35	601, 605
44	600
iv. 5	597
Daniel iv. 9, 31	607
v. 23	605
vi. 22	594, 595
vii. —	608
1, 2, 15	234
8, 24	570
9	605, 606
21	605
viii. 10	607
19	397
ix. —	600, 608
7–10, 15–18	608
24	603
x. 6	602, 605, 607
11	601
20	605
xi. 36	397
xii. 3, 12, 21	607
4	601
7, 9, 10	600, 605
Micah vii. 6	179
Hab. iii. 2	197
3	555
Zech. xii. 10	275
Mal. iii. 1	145
iv. 1	538

II.—APOCRYPHA.

1 Esdras ii. 10	603
2 Esdras ii. 31	478
viii. 3	108
xii. 42	537
Wisdom ii. 17	464
iii. 2	536
vii. 22, 26	464
27	495
Wisdom xii. 10	464
xvi. 21	464
Ecclus. xv. 11, 12	511
Judith v. 19	498
2 Macc. i. 27	498
Baruch i. 15–18	608
ii. 11–16	608
Bel and the Dragon	179

III.—NEW TESTAMENT.

PAGE

Matthew i. 3, 23 169
18 37
21 194
ii. — 68
1 22
18 70
iii. 4 142
iv. 1 179
5, 10 145
v. — 138
8 359
20 494
37 500
48 501
vi. 16 170
24 342
vii. 1, 5, 7 ..... 145, 500
18 204
21 511
22, 23 21
26 500
viii. 5, 11, 16 .... 22, 140
ix. 6, 12 ..... 134, 143
14–17 144
15 554
x. 3 521
27 21
32, 33, 40 .... 217, 221
xi. 10 145
15 221
27–29 ..... 204, 217
xii. 13 ..... 117, 181
40 478
50 179
xiii. 14 275
32, 43 607
55 ..... 155, 522, 523
57 312
xiv. 1 136
5 285
33 157
36 143

PAGE

Matthew xv. 8, 9 145
xvi. 27 221
xviii. 3 75
25 143
xix. 21 181
23, 24 ..... 143, 145
xx — 167
12 498
23 ..... 319, 382
30 219
xxi. 4 285
9, 15 219
10, 11 315
25 285
33 117
41 170
42, 43 ..... 24, 488
44 144
xxii. 14 108
23 169
43 219
xxiii. — 623
12 500
35 ..... 194, 195
37 316
xxiv. — 400
13, 30, 42 221
21 607
22 145
30, 31 .. 217, 221, 400
35 562
xxv. 31 217
xxvi. 17 263
64 400
xxvii. 8, 15, 33, 46 169
19, 24, 25 23
49 87
56 523
65 218
xxviii. 15, 19 ..... 22, 169
18, 20 217
Mark i. — 152

	PAGE
Mark i. 2	145
6	142
29	105, 155
30	102
32	140
ii. 3, 4, 17	143
10	134
18–22	144
iii. 5	117, 154, 157
7	188
17	70, 93
18	521
21	155
v. 7	135, 143
23, 41	143
vi. 3	155, 521
6	157
14	136
19	143
20	285
37	313
39	154
41	145
52	157
vii. 6, 7	145
ix. 14, 36	154, 155
47	143
x. 16, 17	154
23, 25	143, 145
xi. 1	284
15	143
23	500
31	285
xii. 1, 38	117
xiii. 20	145
xiv. 5	313
12	263
15	145
62	218, 607
65	143
xv. 43	143
xvi. 1	160
17, 19	159, 313, [382
9–20	156–164

	PAGE
Luke i. —	86
1–5	121, 122
4	126
ii. 46	199
iii. 2, 21, 23	175
19	136
iv. 8, 9	145
19	314
40	140
44	316
v. 18, 31	143
24	134
33–39	144
vi. —	1 8
	117
16	521
20	500
24, 25	501
42	145
vii. 5	22
27	145
viii. 28	135
ix. 7	136
16	145
31, 33, 43	536, 554
x. 8	346
18	102
xi. —	138
xii. —	138
3	21
54, 57	498
xiii. —	138
26	21
34	316
xiv. —	138, 167
xv. —	181
13	342
xvii. 26–31	536
xviii. 24	145
25	143
xix. 29	285
xx. 5, 6	285
9, 46	117
18	144
xxi. —	97

PAGE

Luke xxi. 6 338
15..... 217
24..... 7
xxii. 3 313
12..... 145
15..... 174, 263
43, 44 70
60..... 218
xxiii. 51..... 316
28..... 22
xxiv. 12..... 313
39..... 186
49, 51..... 313, 314
John i. 1-3 ..... 72-84, 222
11..... 207
13..... 236
14..... 209, 236, 284
25..... 276
28..... 278
29..... 222, 235, 285
32, 40, 42 300
33..... 175
34..... 304
44..... 105, 278, 286
45, 46.. 279, 298, 300
ii. —..... 81
1, 11. 208, 278, 284, 287
5 276
11, 17, 22, 23..284, 287
13, 23..... 276
16..... 207
20..... 279, 302
24..... 312
iii. 3 .....75, 311
4 302
5 .....75, 236
13, 15.. 223, 300, 311
14..... 208
17..... 209
23..... 278
24..... 300
25..... 276
29..... 237
35..... 222
iv. 6 286

PAGE

John iv. 9 276
11..... 278
15..... 303
22..... 207, 277
24..... 81
27, 33..... 277, 287
35, 46 278
42..... 209
44..... 312
52..... 286
v. 1 276
18, 23..... 220, 222
24..... 209
28..... 210
32, 33 283
39, 46 207
vi. —..... 309
2, 4..... 276, 310
7, 9, 11 ..... 286, 304
7-15.... 280, 306, 313
23..... 312
32..... 208, 236
41..... 278
42, 70 300
47, 51, 53 222
52..... 278, 303
55..... 309
62..... 222, 300, 311
71..... 312
vii. 1.....278
15..... 277
22..... 61
24..... 236
27, 31..... 61, 282
35, 36.. 277, 302, 498
37..... 236, 27
41, 42, 49-52.... 279, [282, 298, 304
viii. 15.....97
20..... 286
34..... 537
39..... 235
48..... 276
51-55 237
56..... 207

PAGE

John viii. 58 222
ix. 1–3 ..... 76, 176
2 277
x. 7, 27 76
11 236
14–17 222
16 .....
22, 23 ..... 276, 286
41 285
xi. 2 304
16 ..... 286, 287
18 ..... 278, 304
25 222
44 236
48 281
49–52 ....235, 277, 303
54 ..... 278, 287
55 276
xii. 2, 5 313
16 284
21 286
31, 34 282
35 209
40 275
41 ..... 207, 236
xiii. 1 ..... 263, 276
3, 8 236
11 312
17 500
18 275
22, 23, 24 272, 287, 294
27 313
29 ..... 263, 287
xiv. 5, 8 286
6, 10, 14, 20 222
22 ..... 286, 521
23 ..... 222, 237
xv. 5, 9, 20 .... 222, 237
xvi. 7 313
17 287
20 209
33 236
xvii. 3 ..... 209, 222
5, 10 222
6 237

PAGE

John xviii. 2 287
10 286
13 277
14 304
15 ..... 287, 294
16 300
28 ..... 263, 276
33 188
xix. 12 .....74, 281
21 303
26 287
31 276
35 ..... 284, 304, 305
36, 37 .. 208, 263, 275
39 304
xx. 2, 3 .... 286, 287, 294
17 ..... 300, 311
19, 25 287
27 283
28, 29 ..... 222, 355
31 ..... 131, 222, 312
xxi. — 86, 210, 304
..... 278
3, 7 ..... 287, 294
8, 9 304
12 484
15, 16, 17 236
18 539
19 294
20, 22 .. 211, 287, 304
24..284, 287, 304, 305
25 ..... 290, 305
Acts i. 5 325
9 314
13 521
17, 18 545
21 120
23 364
ii. 20 545
23 ..... 347, 545
24 318
32 490
42, 46 308
iii. 1 294
12 545

PAGE

Acts iii. 15, 18 490
iv. 1 376
11..... 347, 488
12..... 318
18, 21 545
28..... 347
32..... 625
36..... 466
v. 17, 28 ..... 326, 545
30..... 490
39..... 326
42..... 112
vi. 1 468
5 325
vii. 38..... 98
58..... 325
viii. —..... 17, 338, 373
1 325
14..... 294
18..... 17
40..... 325
58..... 466
ix. 7 133
27..... 332, 466
30, 35 ..... 325, 466
x. 27..... 545
33..... 554
38..... 116
39, 42, 43..... 490
41..... 318
42..... 347
47..... 325
ix. 16, 19 325
20..... 112, 466
22, 25 325
28..... 323
30..... 466
xii. 2 287
12..... 467
13..... 347
17..... 497
25..... 466
xiii. 2 466
5 330
7 347

PAGE

Acts xiii. 13..... 325, 349
22..... 318
39..... 334
44, 46, 50 466
46..... 331
51..... 349
xiv. 6 349
12..... 466
xv. —..403, 404, 497, 504
1 ..... 506, 510
5, 8 ..... 325, 326
11..... 505
19..... 510
20, 25, 29 28
22, 25 466
28, 38 325
xvi. 4 ..... 28, 325
6, 10 411
9 323
12, 20 349
15..... 291
xvii. —..... 342–344, 395
5 291
6 349
14..... 325, 397
19–34 342–344
xviii. 1, 19 498
..... 325, 345, 395
6 342
12..... 348
14..... 479
20..... 315
23..... 411
24..... 465
25..... 285, 545
xix. 3 285
9 545
27..... 554
38..... 348
xx. —..... 445
4, 5..322, 325, 349, 396
6 269
16..... 315, 324
17..... 324
19–35 342

	PAGE
Acts xx. 25	338, 444
28	415, 451
29	318
34	416
35	106, 318
xxi. —	338, 471, 569
4, 10	324
8, 16	291, 325
18	323, 497
20	317, 326
21	471
24, 25	28, 331
26	325
29	325, 437
38	351
xxii. —	343
20	325
xxiii. 9	326
26	327
xxiv. 18	325
xxv. 11	325
25	442
xxvi. 18	334
32	325, 442
xxvii. —	6, 323
2	396
xxviii. 3–9	7, 329
7	349
16	323
17	34
Romans i. 4	344
8	397
17	463
ii. 13	509
16	110
17–23	506
25–27	509
28	30
iii. 1	277
2	98
20	408
22, 24	222
28	504
iv. 19	463
v. 1, 9, 10	222

	PAGE
Romans v. 3	509
vi. 6–8	408
7	487
10	490
16	537
vii. 23	408, 509
viii. 17, 18	222, 408, 487
29	463
34	163
ix. 3	333
5	222
7, 8	407
25, 33	486
xi. 13	409
xii. —	463
1, 2	486, 557
6, 7	486
9	463
10–19	291, 463, 486
xiii. —	246
1, 3, 4	479, 486
9	408
xiv. 2	283
9	222
19	463
xv. 10	464
12	219
19	290, 364
27	624
33	413, 463
xvi. —	413
3	498
14	579
20–27	413
21	396
23	291–295
25	110, 413–415
1 Cor. i. 12	300
ii. 3	410
4	397
6	463
iii. 2	397, 463
22	222, 300
iv. 6	410
7	509

PAGE

1 Cor. iv. 9 472
14..... 399
v. 7 ..... 224, 270
9, 11..... 399, 402
vi. 4 75
vii. —..... 283
9 509
11..... 515
19..... 410
29..... 359
viii. 6 222
ix. 5 300
11..... 624
15..... 416
20..... 333
x. —..... 524
1 98
27..... 346
xi. 1 397
8 98
20..... 308
23..... 346
xiv. 16..... 369
26..... 592
33..... 399
xv. 3, 5, 7.....34, 300
6, 7.... 178, 346, 511
9 430
25..... 222
26, 27 ..... 462, 463
33, 35 509
50..... 394
52..... 400
xvi. 7 463
8 269
13..... 342
19, 20 ..... 471, 486
2 Cor.— 409, 416
ii. 17..... 397
iv. 5 112
v. 11, 17, 21 410
vi. 2, 16 ..... 463, 464
vii. 2 397
viii. 6 410
9 222

PAGE

2 Cor. viii. 23..... 614
24..... 463
ix. 6 410
xi. 2, 4 ..... 410, 432
3 98
9, 10 .. 345, 397, 416
13..... 31
22..... 468
24, 25..... 346, 397
xii. 2-4, 7 ..... 410, 564
21..... 524
xiii. 1, 2 ..... 410, 463
5, 14 222
11..... 399
Galatians — 404-413
i. 1 222
6 399
10..... 397
18..... 334
19..... 497, 521
ii. 9 ..... 28, 300, 497
11..... 16
12..... 342, 497
13..... 334
16, 20 ..... 222, 408
iii. 6 407
13 .... 222, 410, 490
16..... 464
19..... 407, 463, 526
27..... 222
iv. 21..... 98
26..... 29
28, 30 407
v. , 3 .... 342, 410, 506
10..... 399
13..... 486, 524
20..... 437
vi. 7 ..... 410, 509
9 399
16..... 30
Eph. i. — 426, 433
1 205
3-14.... 426, 433, 487
7 222
10..... 439

PAGE

Eph. i. 20–22. 75, 163, 222, 487
23 432
ii. 2–9 ..... 222, 439
11 ..... 30, 431
18 ..... 222, 488
19 428
20–22 .. 426, 432, 488
iii. 1–9. 423–428, 430–433
9–11 488
16–20 .. 426, 433, 488
iv. 1–4 423–427
8–10 .... 464, 478, 488
13–27 439
16–25 ..... 427, 432
17–30 ... 342, 424–426
v. 5 222
14 464
15–25 427
25–29 424
vi. 11, 13 439
21, 22 425
23 439
Phil. i. 1 ..... 415, 450
11 509
15 112
18 416
19, 15–26 .. 442, 443
ii. 6, 7, 10 222
5–11 420
24 442
25 614
iii. 2 30
5 ..... 326, 468
9 335
12 558
19 524
20 558
iv. 3 ..... 415, 416, 575
8–19 416
14 554
16 ..... 345, 396
Colossians i.—..... 73
1–26 427
7 417
9, 10 439

PAGE

Colossians i. 15 ..... 416, 433, 558
15–18 .... 221, 222, 433
ii. 2, 4 .... 426, 439, 509
8, 7, 19 426
11 30
21 202
iii. 1–16 ..... 163, 426
4, 10 439
iv. 5–8 ..... 425, 426
10–13 396, 418, 449, 467
14 ..... 143, 322
16 .... 402, 410, 426
21 449
1 Thess. i. 1–3 ..... 396, 595
1, 5, 6, 8 397
9 ..... 396, 399
ii. 4, 5, 6, 7 397
9 ..... 397, 398, 416
14–16 .... 278, 396, 397
iii. 6. 11 ..... 222, 395
iv. 11, 12 399
13–18 ..... 395, 400
v. 2 499
6 486
8 439
12 415
21 177
23 509
2 Thess. i. 7, 8 260
ii. —..... 398, 402
1–12 ..... 399, 401
2–11 ..... 398, 399
8 439
14 110
iii. 3 416
4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16..398
[399
17 402
iv. 14 399
1 Tim. i. 1, 4, 14 439
17 434
ii. 4, 5 ..... 222, 439
14 98
iii. 2 ..... 291, 450
iv. 3 ..... 202, 283

PAGE

1 Tim. iv. 12 ..... 439, 443
v. 10..... 291
vi. 11..... 439
20..... 422
2 Tim. i. 10..... 462
13..... 439
15–18 445
17..... 359, 437
ii. 8 110
22, 25 439
iii. 7 439
iv. 1 490
6–8 ..... 221, 439
9–22....445–450, 499
11..... 322
16..... 443, 461
19..... 498
20..... 437
Titus i. 1, 7 .....439, 450
8, 14 ..... 291, 437
ii. 14 515
iii. 8 506
10..... 437
Philemon 22..... 442
24..... 322, 396, 448
Hebrews i. 1 464
2 ..... 455, 463
3 ..... 163, 454, 464
4, 6, 7, 13....454, 463, [464, 558
ii. 2 464
3 ..... 460, 471
8, 14..... 462, 463
9, 17..... 455, 558
iii. 1 454
iv. 12..... 73
v. 12, 14.... 98, 463, 471
vi. —..... 457, 470
3, 10..... 463, 469
4 509
16..... 455
viii. 1, 6 ..... 163, 526
10..... 463
ix. 28..... 490
x. —..... 472

PAGE

Hebrews x. 12..... 163
5, 28, 38 .... 463, 464
33–37 .. 461, 472, 473
xi. —..... 508
12, 13 ..... 463, 485
33..... 595
xii. —..... 473
2–4 .... 163, 469–473
11..... 508
14–17.. .... 463, 464
20..... 342
xiii. 1–3 .... 282, 463, 470
5, 7 ..... 463, 464
13..... 481
20..... 463
23..... 462, 468
24..... 472
James i. 1 512
3, 4, 5.. 489, 500, 501, [509
6 498
7, 8 495
1..... 490, 498
12..... 221, 501, 607
13..... 511
15, 17 ..... 509, 510
22..... 500, 509
25..... 500
26, 27 ..... 495, 513
ii. —..... 503
1 512
2 ..... 495, 499, 592
5 500
6, 7 .... 495, 499, 512
8 ..... 494, 509
10–12 ..... 509, 510
13..... 496
18..... 509
21..... 499
23..... 496
24..... 505
25..... 499, 508
iii. 2 495
4 498
11, 12 498

PAGE

James iii. 15–18 ..... 495, 509
iv. 1–10.... 489, 495, 501
11, 12 ..... 495, 500
13, 16 ..... 496, 499
17..... 510
v. 1–6 ..... 495, 501
4, 10..... 499
7, 8, 9 .. 498, 508, 512
11, 12 ..... 495, 500
13..... 492
14, 15 512
17..... 498
1 Peter i. 2 347
3–12..... 488, 491
7 ..... 236, 489, 557
10–13 .. 236, 488, 490
14..... 485–487, 544
18..... 236, 557
19..... 236, 544
20..... 347, 488
22..... 236
23..... 236, 491
24..... 490
ii. 2 544
4–7 ..... 347, 468
5 ..... 236, 487
6–8 ..... 347, 486
9–10....236, 485, 544, [555, 557
12..... 544
13, 14, 16.... 486–488
20..... 479, 491
24..... 490
25..... 557
iii. 2 544
4 488
8, 9 486
18. .... 236, 488, 490
19, 20 .. 477, 488, 491
21..... 491, 544
22..... 163, 488
iv. 1 ..... 487, 544
3 ..... 362, 485
4 557
5 490

PAGE

1 Peter iv. 9 291
10, 11, 13.... 98, 486, [487
12..... 491
16..... 479
19..... 557
v. 1 ..... 294, 487, 490
2, 3 ..... 236, 492
4, 5 .... 221, 342, 490
8 486
9 491
13.. 92, 236, 294, 483, [484
14..... 486
2 Peter i. 1, 7 ..... 544, 545
3–5 ..... 544, 555
8, 9 544
10–16 ..... 539, 545
12..... 554
15..... 536
17..... 538
18..... 539
19, 21 537
ii. 1–3 .... 535, 544, 553
4, 5, 8 .. 342, 530–536
7–9 ..... 544, 545
12..... 544
13–15.... 28, 544, 545
16, 18 ..... 544, 545
19..... 537, 544
21, 22 ..... 530, 545
iii. 1 ..... 478, 539
5–7 544
8 535
9 537
10..... 500, 538, 545
11, 12, 14.... 537, 544
15 ..... 28, 390, 539
16..... 544
1 John i. 1 ..... 283, 284
3–5 80
4 209
7 222
ii. 2, 5 ..... 222, 237
11–13 ..... 209, 236

PAGE

1 John ii. 18–28 211
iii. 1 78
3–9 ..... 222, 236
12–14 ..... 209, 236
iv. 3 ..... 283, 293
4 236
9, 14 209
13 222
v. 4 236
6 210
15–20 305
24 209
2 John —..211, 236, 292–295
3 John — 291–295
12 305
Jude 1, 4, 17..519, 522, 524
6 525
7, 8 ..... 27, 523
9 525
11 27
12, 13 523–525
14–16 ..... 527, 528
20 ..... 342, 528
Rev. i. 1, 6, 9 ..... 234, 236
5 433
7 ..... 221, 236, 607
8, 17 220
10 256
14 606
16 237
ii. 2 .....26, 396
4, 5 31
7, 11, 17..221, 236, 257
9 26
10 ..... 221, 501
14, 15 26
16, 27 256
20–22 524
23, 26 221
iii. 3 ..... 221, 500
5, 12, 21..221, 236, 257
8–10 ..... 26, 236
9, 12 ..... 26, 239
14, 21.. 219, 220, 235, [433

PAGE

Rev. iii. 18, 20 236
v. 1–3 228
5 219
6 256
6, 9..29, 219, 235, 236
9–14 256
12, 13 ..... 219, 236
vi. 4, 9 236
9, 10 255
vii. 4–8 29
9–17 256
14, 15 236
ix. 20 605
x. 4 290
5 605
7 433
8 ..... 259, 260
xi. 2 ..... 251, 261
8 ..... 30, 256
12 311
15 ..... 259, 260
xii. 7 605
11, 12 ..... 236, 256
xiii. 7 605
3, 6, 8, 12, 14 .... 236, [244
11 246
xiv. 8, 12 ..... 236, 239
xvi. 12 245
15 500
xvii. 5 235
6 ..... 255, 261, 472
10, 11 ..... 243, 244
16, 17 246–251
xviii. 20, 24.. 236, 255, 261
xix. 6 605
7 ..... 237, 432
11 200
13 235
16 ..... 219, 607
20 ..... 246, 257
xx. 2 239
4 605
6 ..... 220, 236, 257
11 605

	PAGE
Rev. xxi. 2	29, 232, 237, 432
3	236
6	252
7	236
8	257
9, 14	433
Rev. xxii. 1, 3	220
2	232
7, 9	237
13, 16	219, 220
17	236, 433
18, 19	225

THE END.

Printed at The University Press, *Dublin.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

NON-MIRACULOUS CHRISTIANITY,

AND OTHER SERMONS,

PREACHED IN THE

Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin.

GNOSTICISM AND AGNOSTICISM,

AND OTHER SERMONS.

Bib.Lit
S

Salmon, George
A historical introduction to the study
of the New Testament.

13315

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU, Boston